arXiv:gr-qc/0207022v1 4 Jul 2002

Global behavior of solutions to the static spherically symmetric EYM equations [*][†]

Todd A. Oliynyk [‡]

H.P. Künzle [§]

Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Canada T6G 2G1

Abstract

The set of all possible spherically symmetric magnetic static Einstein-Yang-Mills field equations for an arbitrary compact semi-simple gauge group G was classified in two previous papers. Local analytic solutions near the center and a black hole horizon as well as those that are analytic and bounded near infinity were shown to exist. Some globally bounded solutions are also known to exist because they can be obtained by embedding solutions for the $G = SU(2)$ case which is well understood. Here we derive some asymptotic properties of an arbitrary global solution, namely one that exists locally near a radial value r_0, has positive mass $m(r)$ at r_0 and develops no horizon for all $r > r_0$. The set of asymptotic values of the Yang-Mills potential (in a suitable well defined gauge) is shown to be finite in the so-called regular case, but may form a more complicated real variety for models obtained from irregular rotation group actions.

1 Introduction

Static spherically symmetric and globally regular solutions to the Einstein-Yang-Mills (EYM) equations for the gauge group $SU(2)$ were first found numerically by Bartnik and Mckinnon [3]. They showed that although there are no static, finite energy pure Yang-Mills fields [11], [9] when coupled to the gravitational instead of the Higgs field physically meaningfull classical solutions where possible. As is standard, we will refer to these static, globally regular solutions as *solitons*. Shortly after the solitons were discovered, static spherically symmetric $SU(2)$-EYM black holes were found numerically [4, 27, 51].

The $SU(2)$-EYM black hole solutions provided counter examples to the no-hair conjecture and stimulated investigations into other matter fields coupled to gravity for the purpose of finding solutions that violated the no hair conjecture. Consequently, it has been realized that violation of the no hair conjecture is typical for gravity coupled to non-Abelian gauge theories. More recently [18, 19], axisymmetric static black hole and soliton solutions to the $SU(2)$-EYM equations have been constructed numerically, providing dramatic examples of violations to the no hair conjecture. All of these solutions have shown that equilibrium configurations of black holes can be much more complicated than had been previously thought.

---

[*] PACS: 04.40.Nr, 11.15.Kc

[†] 2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification* Primary 83C20, 83C22; Secondary 53C30, 17B81.

[‡] todd.oliynyk@ise.canberra.edu.au . Present address: School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia.

[§] hp.kunzle@ualberta.ca

Existence of the soliton and black hole solutions to the $SU(2)$-EYM equations was first established analytically by Smoller, Wasserman, Yau, and McLeod [43,48,49]. Global existence was also established by Breitenlohner, Forgács, and Maison in [5] using different methods. Smoller and Wasserman have extensively studied the $SU(2)$-EYM equations [41,42,44–47] and have completely classified [54] the solutions which are defined in the far field, i.e. for large radius r. One surprising result that they have discovered is that any solution that is defined in the far field is actually defined on the whole interval $(0,\infty)$. This is not the usual situation for solutions to non-linear systems of differential equations where one normally expects global existence for only a small subset of the initial conditions. On the other hand for such solutions the mass will typically be negative below some limiting radius, and there is a singularity at r=0.

For gauge groups G other than $SU(2)$, much less is known and the investigations have almost exclusively focused on $SU(n)$ and only for the most obvious ansatz for the spherically symmetric gauge field. Recently, the existence of $SU(3)$ black hole solutions which are not embedded $SU(2)$ solutions has been established analytically [39]. For $SU(3)$ and $SU(4)$ both solitons and black hole solutions which are not embedded $SU(2)$ solutions have been found numerically [21,23,26]. From the numerical solutions it is clear that the existence proof in [39] does not cover all the possibilities. So even in $SU(3)$ there is still work to be done.

For arbitrary compact gauge groups even less is known. No numerical solutions have been constructed for $G \neq SU(n)$ and the only analytical work we are aware of is contained in the papers [1,7,8]. However, in these papers, only the so called *regular actions* of the symmetry group are considered which, as we shall see later, is a strong condition. For a review of these developments in EYM theory, see [52]. The EYM equations continue to attract attention. Rotating $SU(2)$-EYM black holes have been constructed numerically [20] and the $SU(2)$-EYM equations with a cosmological constant have been studied [28–30,37,40,55].

In this paper we show that a number of the analytical results derived in [27,41–49] generalize to "magnetic type" EYM solutions for arbitrary compact gauge groups and arbitrary actions of the symmetry group $K = SU(2)$. More precisely, our main result (Theorem 7.1) is the behavior for $r \to \infty$ of the solution under the assumption that it exists at some value r_0 and that the mass is positive at r_0 and no horizon develops for $r > r_0$. It follows easily from a scaling argument that any global solution of the $SU(2)$ theory induces "embedded solutions" for any model with arbitrary G and arbitrary action of K. However, these special solutions are extremely unstable against the slightest change of the parameters that determine it near 0 and ∞. In fact, numerical experimentation shows that the same probably holds for most other solutions, if any, which makes a general numerical exploration of the set of all global solutions extremely difficult if not almost impossible. This unfortunate situation is not quite unexpected in view of the instability results with respect to time dependence obtained in [8] for regular actions and general compact gauge groups.

The article is organized as follows. Sections 2 and 3 contain a review of the results from Lie algebra theory and the theory of three dimensional semisimple Lie algebras based largely on [16] and [10]. The static spherically symmetric EYM equations are presented in section 4. In sections 5 and 6 we include a determination of which actions are *regular* for the classical simple gauge groups based on the orbit theory of [10]. (We have previously computed them for the exceptional Lie algebras in [36].) Our main result concerning the asymptotic behavior of solutions to the EYM equations (Theorem 7.1) is given in section 7. The remainder of the paper is devoted to the proof of this theorem.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we fix our Lie algebra notation and collect some results from Lie algebra theory that will be required in the following sections. Many of the results are well known and can be found, for example, in [16] and [24]. Throughout this article G will always denote a real compact semisimple

Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$. The adjoint action of G on $\mathfrak{g}_0$ will be denoted by Ad, while ad will denote the adjoint action of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ on $\mathfrak{g}_0$, i.e. $\mathrm{ad}(X)(Y) = [X,Y]$ for all X,Y in $\mathfrak{g}_0$. The complexification of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ will be denoted by $\mathfrak{g}$. The ad action can then be extended by complex linearity to an action of $\mathfrak{g}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ so that $\mathrm{ad}(X)(Y) := [X,Y]$ for all X,Y in $\mathfrak{g}$. We will use the notation $\mathfrak{g}^X$ for the centralizer of a single element $X \in \mathfrak{g}$. In other words,

$$\mathfrak{g}^X := \{\, Y \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [X,Y] = 0 \,\} .$$

Similarly, $\mathfrak{g}_0^X$ is the centralizer of an element $X \in \mathfrak{g}_0$.

We will let $(\cdot|\cdot)$ be any non-degenerate ad-invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$ that restricts to a negative definite inner product on $\mathfrak{g}_0$. By ad-invariance we mean that

$$([X,Y]|Z) = (X|[Y,Z]) \quad \forall\, X,Y,Z \in \mathfrak{g} .$$

For example, we could take $(\cdot|\cdot)$ to be the Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}$. For later use, we introduce a non-degenerate Hermitian inner product $\langle\,\cdot|\cdot\,\rangle$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ defined by

$$\langle\, X|Y \,\rangle := -\,(c(X)|Y) \quad \forall\, X,Y \in \mathfrak{g} ,$$

where $c : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}$ is the conjugation operator determined by the compact real form $\mathfrak{g}_0$. From the ad-invariance of $(\cdot|\cdot)$ and the fact that conjugation is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$ it follows that $\langle\,\cdot|\cdot\,\rangle$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\, X|Y \,\rangle &= \overline{\langle\, Y|X \,\rangle} , \\ \langle\, c(X)|c(Y) \,\rangle &= \overline{\langle\, X|Y \,\rangle} , \\ \langle\, [X,c(Y)]|Z \,\rangle &= \langle\, X|[Y,Z] \,\rangle \end{aligned}$$

for all $X,Y,Z \in \mathfrak{g}$. Treating $\mathfrak{g}$ as a $\mathbb{R}$-linear space by restricting scalar multiplication to multiplication by reals, we can introduce a positive definite inner product $\langle\langle\,\cdot|\cdot\,\rangle\rangle : \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \to \mathbb{R}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ defined by

$$\langle\langle\, X|Y \,\rangle\rangle := \mathrm{Re}\langle\, X|Y \,\rangle \quad \forall\, X,Y \in \mathfrak{g} .$$

Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the norm induced on $\mathfrak{g}$ by $\langle\langle\,\cdot|\cdot\,\rangle\rangle$, i.e.

$$\|X\| := \sqrt{\langle\langle\, X|X \,\rangle\rangle} \quad \forall\, X \in \mathfrak{g} . \tag{2.1}$$

From the invariance properties satisfied by $\langle\,\cdot|\cdot\,\rangle$, it is straightforward to verify that $\langle\langle\,\cdot|\cdot\,\rangle\rangle$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle\, X|Y \,\rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle\, Y|X \,\rangle\rangle , \\ \langle\langle\, c(X)|c(Y) \,\rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle\, X|Y \,\rangle\rangle , \\ \langle\langle\, [X,c(Y)]|Z \,\rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle\, X|[Y,Z] \,\rangle\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

for all $X,Y,Z \in \mathfrak{g}$.

Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $R \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ the roots determined by $\mathfrak{h}$. Then we have the Cartan decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} \mathbb{C}\mathbf{e}_\alpha$$

where the nonzero vectors $\mathbf{e}_\alpha$ satisfy

$$[H, \mathbf{e}_\alpha] = \alpha(H)\mathbf{e}_\alpha \quad \forall\, H \in \mathfrak{h} . \tag{2.3}$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{C}\mathbf{e}_\alpha = \{\, X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [H, X] = \alpha(H)X \quad \forall\, H \in \mathfrak{h} \,\} \,. \tag{2.4}$$

A straightforward consequence of (2.4), the Jacobi identity, and the ad-invariance of $(\cdot|\cdot)$ is that

$$[\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_\beta] \in \mathbb{C}\mathbf{e}_{\alpha+\beta} \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$(\mathbf{e}_\alpha|\mathbf{e}_\beta) = 0 \qquad \text{if } \alpha + \beta \neq 0. \tag{2.6}$$

Following [16], we define $\mathbf{t}_\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}$ as the unique vector in $\mathfrak{h}$ that satisfies

$$(\mathbf{t}_\alpha|H) = \alpha(H) \quad \forall\, H \in \mathfrak{h} \,.$$

Then

$$(\alpha|\beta) := (\mathbf{t}_\alpha|\mathbf{t}_\beta) \quad \forall\, \alpha, \beta \in R \tag{2.7}$$

defines a positive definite inner product on the space $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\, \alpha \mid \alpha \in R \,\}$. We will use $|\cdot|$ to denote the norm of this inner product. It will be useful to introduce the "dual roots" $\alpha^\vee$ defined by

$$\alpha^\vee := \frac{2\alpha}{|\alpha|^2} \,.$$

We can use the dual roots to define the angle bracket

$$\langle\, \alpha, \beta \,\rangle := (\alpha|\beta^\vee) \ ,$$

and the vectors

$$\mathbf{h}_\alpha := \mathbf{t}_{\alpha^\vee} \,.$$

Choosing a base Δ for R, we then have

$$\mathfrak{h} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta} \mathbb{C}\mathbf{h}_\alpha \,.$$

Also the Cartan matrix C is defined via

$$C_{\alpha\beta} := \langle\, \alpha, \beta \,\rangle \quad \forall\, \alpha, \beta \in \Delta \,.$$

A useful relation that is an easy consequence of the above definitions is

$$[\mathbf{h}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_\beta] = C_{\beta\alpha}\mathbf{e}_\beta \quad \forall\, \alpha, \beta \in \Delta \,. \tag{2.8}$$

Since $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is a compact real form of $\mathfrak{g}$, the vectors $\{\, \mathbf{h}_\alpha,\ \mathbf{e}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in R \,\}$ can always be chosen to satisfy the following relations

$$c(\mathbf{h}_\alpha) = -\mathbf{h}_\alpha, \quad c(\mathbf{e}_\alpha) = -\mathbf{e}_{-\alpha} \quad \forall\, \alpha \in R \,, \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$[\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}] = \mathbf{h}_\alpha \tag{2.10}$$

$$[\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_\beta] = N_{\alpha,\beta}\mathbf{e}_{\alpha+\beta} \qquad \text{if } \alpha + \beta \in R \tag{2.11}$$

$$[\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_\beta] = 0 \qquad \text{if } \alpha + \beta \neq 0 \text{ and } \alpha + \beta \notin R \tag{2.12}$$

where the constants $N_{\alpha,\beta}$ are real and $N_{\alpha,\beta} = -N_{-\alpha,-\beta}$. We are also free to normalize the vectors $\mathbf{e}_\alpha$ as follows

$$(\mathbf{e}_\alpha|\mathbf{e}_\alpha) = \frac{2}{|\alpha|} \quad \forall\, \alpha \in R\,.$$

A basis satisfying these conditions will be called a *Chevalley-Weyl basis*. The compact real form $\mathfrak{g}_0$ can then be written as

$$\mathfrak{g}_0 = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Delta} \mathbb{R}i\mathbf{h}_\alpha \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha\in R^+} \mathbb{R}\left(\mathbf{e}_\alpha - \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}\right) \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha\in R^+} \mathbb{R}i\left(\mathbf{e}_\alpha + \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}\right)\,,$$

where R^+ is the set of positive roots. The subspace

$$\mathfrak{h}_0 = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Delta} \mathbb{R}i\mathbf{h}_\alpha \tag{2.13}$$

is called the real Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_0$. Notice that $\mathfrak{h}$ is the complexification of $\mathfrak{h}_0$. As in the complex case, a real Cartan subalgebra can be defined independently as a maximal Abelian subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_0$.

From (2.13) and the fact that $(\alpha|\beta) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in R$, it is clear that $\alpha(H) \in i\mathbb{R}$ for every $H \in \mathfrak{h}_0$ and $\alpha \in R$. This allows us to define a subset $\mathcal{W}_\mathbb{R}$ of $\mathfrak{h}_0$ called the *real fundamental open Weyl chamber* by

$$\mathcal{W}_\mathbb{R} := \{\, H \in \mathfrak{h}_0 \mid -i\alpha(H) > 0 \quad \forall\alpha \in \Delta \,\}\,.$$

We will also need a related subset $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathfrak{h}$ called the *(complex) fundamental open Weyl chamber* which is defined by

$$\mathcal{W} := \{\, H \in \mathfrak{h} \mid \alpha(H) > 0 \quad \forall\alpha \in \Delta \,\}\,.$$

Observe that we have the inclusion $\mathcal{W} \subset i\mathfrak{h}_0$.

If we let $\exp : \mathfrak{g}_0 \to G$ denote the exponential map, then the kernel of exp is by definition

$$\ker(\exp) = \{\, X \in g_0 \mid \exp(X) = \mathbb{1} \,\}\,.$$

The subset of ker(exp) given by

$$\mathcal{I} := \ker(\exp) \cap \mathfrak{h}_0$$

is known as the *integral lattice*.

3 Three dimensional semisimple Lie subalgebras

Later on we will see that classifying spherically symmetric Yang-Mills potentials is related to the problem of classifying three dimensional semisimple Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ up to conjugation by inner automorphisms. This problem of classifying three dimensional semisimple Lie subalgebras has been studied extensively by many authors beginning with Mal'cev [31] and Dynkin [12]. For a modern presentation and relations to nilpotent orbits see [10].

It is well known that any three dimensional semisimple Lie algebra is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_2\mathbb{C}$ and is spanned by three vectors $\{\, \Omega_0, \Omega_+, \Omega_- \,\}$ that satisfy the commutation relationships

$$[\Omega_0, \Omega_\pm] = \pm 2\, \Omega_\pm \quad \text{and} \quad [\Omega_+, \Omega_-] = \Omega_0\,. \tag{3.1}$$

The vectors $\{ \Omega_0, \Omega_+, \Omega_- \}$ are known collectively as a *complex standard triple.* Instead of working directly with $\mathfrak{sl}_2\mathbb{C}$-subalgebras, we will often find it more convenient to work with A_1-vectors. An *A_1-vector* is a vector $\Omega_0 \in \mathfrak{g}$ for which there exists two vectors Ω_+, Ω_- such that the commutation relationships (3.1) are satisfied. The set of all A_1-vectors will be denoted by $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}}$. A distinguished subset of $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}}$ is the set $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}}$ of *real A_1-vectors.* These are the A_1-vectors Ω_0 for which Ω_+, Ω_- can be chosen so that

$$c(\Omega_0) = -\Omega_0 \quad \text{and} \quad c(\Omega_+) = -\Omega_- \tag{3.2}$$

are also satisfied. Notice that in the real case if we define vectors Ω_1, Ω_2, and Ω_3 in $\mathfrak{g}_0$ via

$$\Omega_0 = 2i\Omega_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_\pm = \mp\Omega_1 - i\Omega_2 \, , \tag{3.3}$$

then Ω_1, Ω_2, and Ω_3 satisfy

$$[\Omega_i, \Omega_j] = \epsilon_{ij}{}^k \Omega_k \, . \tag{3.4}$$

This shows that $\mathrm{span}_\mathbb{R}\{\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3\}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{so}_3\mathbb{R}$. Therefore it is appropriate to call $\{ \Omega_0, \Omega_+, \Omega_- \}$ a *real standard triple.*

Let

$$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}) := \{ \phi \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{g}) \mid [\phi(X), \phi(Y)] = \phi([X,Y]) \text{ for all } X, Y \in \mathfrak{g} \}$$

denote the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{g}$. The *group of inner automorphisms* $\mathrm{Int}(\mathfrak{g})$ is defined to be the subgoup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by automorphisms of the form $\exp(\mathrm{ad}(X))$ where X is any element of $\mathfrak{g}$ for which $\mathrm{ad}(X)$ is nilpotent. It is a standard result in Lie algebra theory that $\mathrm{Int}(\mathfrak{g})$ is the identity component of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$. With these conventions we define

$$[\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}}] := \{ \ \mathrm{Int}(\mathfrak{g}) \text{ conjugacy classes of } A_1\text{-vectors of } \mathfrak{g} \ \} \, , \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$[\mathcal{A}_1] := \{ \ \mathrm{Int}(\mathfrak{g}) \text{ conjugacy classes of } \mathfrak{sl}_2\mathbb{C}\text{-subalgebras of } \mathfrak{g} \ \} \, . \tag{3.6}$$

Conjugacy classes of an element x will be denoted by $[x]$.

It is well known [10] that the map

$$[\mathcal{A}_1] \longrightarrow [\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}}] \ : \ [\mathrm{span}_\mathbb{C}\{\Omega_0, \Omega_+, \Omega_-\}] \longmapsto [\Omega_0] \tag{3.7}$$

is a bijection. In [12] Dynkin proved that for a fixed Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ and base $\Delta = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_\ell\}$ there exists a unique A_1-vector Ω_0 in a conjugacy class $[\Omega_0']$ such that

$$\alpha(\Omega_0) = 0, \ 1, \text{ or } 2 \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Delta.$$

He then defined the *characteristic* $\chi([\Omega_0'])$ of the conjugacy class $[\Omega_0']$ by

$$\chi = \chi([\Omega_0']) := \big(\alpha_1(\Omega_0), \ldots, \alpha_\ell(\Omega_0)\big) \, .$$

The importance of the characteristic is that it is a complete invariant, i.e. $[\Omega_0''] = [\Omega_0']$ if and only if $\chi([\Omega_0'']) = \chi([\Omega_0'])$. Consequently,

$$\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} \text{ is in one-to-one correspondence with } [\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}}]. \tag{3.8}$$

For our purposes, we are more interested in the set $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$. We then have the useful result:

Lemma 3.1.

$$\mathcal{A}_1^{v,\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} = \mathcal{A}_1^{v} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} \subset \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ we only need to verify the reverse inclusion. So assume that $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$. Then there exists $\Omega_+, \Omega_- \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that $\mathcal{S} := \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{\Omega_0, \Omega_+, \Omega_-\} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2\mathbb{C}$. Let Ω_1, Ω_2, and Ω_3 be as in (3.3). Then $\mathcal{S}_0 := \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3\}$ is a compact real form for $\mathcal{S}$. Now $\mathcal{S}_0$ sits inside some maximal compact real form $\mathfrak{g}_0' \subset \mathfrak{g}$. But $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is also a maximal compact real form and as all maximal compact real forms are conjugate by inner autmorphism (see theorem 2.1 p. 256 in [15]) there exist a $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ such that $\sigma(\mathcal{S}_0) \in \mathfrak{g}_0$. In particular $\sigma(\Omega_3) \in \mathfrak{g}_0$. We also have that $\Omega_3 \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ and hence it follows by proposition 8.3.1 of [38] that $\mathrm{Ad}_g(\Omega_3) = \sigma(\Omega_3)$ for some $\mathfrak{g} \in G$. Thus $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{\Omega_0, \mathrm{Ad}_{g^{-1}} \circ \sigma(\Omega_+), \mathrm{Ad}_{g^{-1}} \circ \sigma(\Omega_-)\}$ is a real standard triple. □

It is worthwhile to note that not every combination of 0, 1, and 2 defines the characteristic of some conjugacy class $[\Omega_0]$. In fact, the total number of conjugacy classes is far less than the potential 3^ℓ. For example, the number of characteristics for $A_{\ell-1}$ is equal to to the number of partitions of ℓ and this is asymptotically equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}\ell} e^{\pi\sqrt{\frac{2\ell}{3}}} ,$$

which is much smaller than $3^{\ell-1}$.

It is not difficult to show that for every Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ there is always a characteristic of the form

$$\chi = (2, 2, \ldots, 2) .$$

In other words there always exists an A_1-vector Ω_0 such that $\alpha(\Omega_0) = 2$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta$. These distinguished elements will be called *principal A_1-vectors.*

The Dynkin diagram of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ labeled with the characteristic numbers $\alpha_k(\Omega_0)$ above the nodes is called a *weighted Dynkin diagram.* All the possible weighted Dynkin diagrams of the exceptional Lie algebras G_2, F_4, E_6 and E_8 were determined by Dynkin in [12]. A listing of these diagrams can be found in [10] section 8.4 .

For the classical Lie algebras the weighted Dynkin diagrams are not optimal for classifying the conjugacy classes of $[\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}}]$. Instead, a different method based on the "partitions of n" is used. To describe this method, we first consider $\mathfrak{sl}_n\mathbb{C} = A_{n-1}$ for which the classification problem can be solved by elementary methods. A *partition* of n is an k-tuple $\mathbf{d} := (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k)$ such that

$$d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \ldots \geq d_k > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad n = \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j . \tag{3.9}$$

If a number s is repeated q times in a partition we will denote this by s^q and q will be called the *multiplicity* of s. For example, the partition $(9,9,9,6,4,4,2,1,1,1)$ will also be written as $(9^3, 6, 4^2, 2, 1^3)$. The set of all partitions of n will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}(n)$. Using $\mathfrak{sl}_2\mathbb{C}$ representation theory, it not hard to show that the there exists a bijection from $[\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}}]$ to $\mathcal{P}(n)$. Moreover, for each partition $(d_1, \ldots, d_k)$ a canonical representative $\Omega_0^{(d_1,\ldots,d_k)}$ of the conjugacy class can be constructed as follows. For each $s \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$\Omega_0^s = \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s-2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s-4 & & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & -s+2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -s \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.10}$$

Then

$$\Omega_0^{(d_1,\dots,d_k)} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} \Omega_0^{d_j-1} \tag{3.11}$$

is the canonical representative. There also exists simple formulas for $\Omega_\pm$. For each $s \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$\Omega_+^s = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{1(s)} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2(s-1)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3(s-2)} & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & \sqrt{(s)1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\Omega_-^s = (\Omega_+^s)^{\mathrm{t}} \tag{3.13}$$

where $^{\mathrm{t}}$ denotes the transpose of a matrix. Then

$$\Omega_\pm^{(d_1,\dots,d_k)} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} \Omega_\pm^{d_j-1}\,. \tag{3.14}$$

From these formulas it is easy to verify that

$$\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{\Omega_0^{(d_1,\dots,d_k)}, \Omega_+^{(d_1,\dots,d_k)}, \Omega_-^{(d_1,\dots,d_k)}\} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2\mathbb{C}\,.$$

Similar results can be obtained for the other classical Lie algebras, with the conjugacy classes of $[\mathcal{A}_1^{\vee}]$ being parametrized by a subset of $\mathcal{P}(n)$ for appropriate n. A canonical representative of the conjugacy class can also be constructed although the formulas are more complicated. All of this can be found in chapter 5 of [10], we only state the results.

Theorem 3.2. *If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_n\mathbb{C}$ then there exists a bijection between $[\mathcal{A}_1^{\vee}]$ and $\mathcal{P}(n)$.*

Theorem 3.3. *If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}\mathbb{C}$ then there exists a bijection between $[\mathcal{A}_1^{\vee}]$ and the set of partitions of $2n+1$ in which the even parts occur with even multiplicity.*

Example: $\mathfrak{so}_7\mathbb{C}$ contains six conjugacy classes parametrized by the partitions (7), $(5,1^2)$, $(3,1^4)$, $(3,2^2)$, $(3^2,1)$, and $(2^2,1^3)$.

Theorem 3.4. *If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}_{2n}\mathbb{C}$ then there exists a bijection between $[\mathcal{A}_1^{\vee}]$ and the set of partitions of $2n$ in which the odd parts occur with even multiplicity.*

Example: $\mathfrak{sp}_6\mathbb{C}$ contains seven conjugacy classes parametrized by the partitions (6), $(4,2)$, $(4,1^2)$, (3^2), (2^3), $(2^2,1^2)$, and $(2,1^4)$.

Theorem 3.5. *If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}_{2n}\mathbb{C}$ then there exists a bijection between $[\mathcal{A}_1^{\vee}]$ and the set of partitions of $2n$ in which the even parts occurs with even multiplicity except that the "very even" partitions $(d_1,\dots,d_k)$(those with only even parts, each having even multiplicity) correspond to conjugacy classes labeled $(d_1,\dots,d_k)_I$ and $(d_1,\dots,d_k)_{II}$.*

Example: $\mathfrak{so}_8\mathbb{C}$ contains eleven conjugacy classes parametrized by the partitions $(7,1)$, $(5,3)$, $(4^2)_I$, $(4^2)_{II}$, $(5,1^3)$, $(3^2,1^2)$, $(3,2^2,1)$, $(2^4)_I$, $(2^4)_{II}$, $(3,1^5)$, and $(2^2,1^4)$.

4 Static spherically symmetric field equations

Let P be a principal bundle with a compact semi-simple structure group G over a static spherically symmetric space-time manifold. We consider only actions of the group $SU(2)$ by principal bundle automorphisms on P that project onto the action of $SO(3)$ on space-time which defines the spherical symmetry. This ignores some interesting effects due to the fact that $SO(3)$ is not simply connected. For an analysis of $SO(3)$ actions on $SU(n)$ bundles see [2].

Equivalence classes of these spherically symmetric G-bundles are in one-to-one correspondence to conjugacy classes of homomorphisms of the isotropy subgroup, $U(1)$ in this case, into G. The $U(1)$ conjugacy classes are classified by the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. [proposition 1, [6]] *The set of conjugacy classes of homomorphisms* $\lambda : U(1) \to G$ *is in one-to-one correspondence with the set* $\mathcal{I} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbb{R}}$*. The conjugacy class of* λ *is characterized by* $\lambda'(\mathbf{e}) \in \mathcal{I} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbb{R}}$ *where* $\lambda' : \mathfrak{u}(1) \to \mathfrak{g}_0$ *is the induced Lie algebra homomorphism and* $\mathbf{e} = 2\pi i$ *is the standard basis vector in the integral lattice of* $\mathfrak{u}(1)$*.*

So, once a principal G-bundle with an $SU(2)$-action is fixed, it determines a element $\mathcal{I} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbb{R}}$ which we will denote as $-4\pi\Lambda_3$.

Wang's theorem [25, 53] on connections that are invariant under actions transitive on the base manifold has been adapted to spherically symmetric space-time manifolds by Brodbeck and Straumann [6]. They show that in a Schwarzschild type coordinate system (t, r, θ, ϕ) and the metric

$$g = -N(r)S(r)^2 dt^2 + N(r)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \ . \tag{4.1}$$

a gauge can always be chosen such that the $\mathfrak{g}_0$-valued Yang-Mills connection form is locally given by

$$A = \tilde{A} + \hat{A} \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$\tilde{A} = N(r)S(r)\mathcal{A}(r)dt + \mathcal{B}(r)dr \tag{4.3}$$

is a $\mathfrak{g}_0^{\Lambda_3}$-valued 1-form, and

$$\hat{A} = \Lambda_1(r)d\theta + (\Lambda_2(r)\sin\theta + \Lambda_3\cos\theta)d\phi \tag{4.4}$$

where Λ_1 and Λ_2 are $\mathfrak{g}_0$-valued maps that satisfy

$$[\Lambda_2, \Lambda_3] = \Lambda_1 \quad \text{and} \quad [\Lambda_3, \Lambda_1] = \Lambda_2. \tag{4.5}$$

By the results of [34] §3.3 we are free to use the temporal gauge and therefore set

$$\mathcal{B} = 0 \ . \tag{4.6}$$

We will make one more assumption on the form of the gauge potential, namely that $\mathcal{A} = 0$. In analogy with the electromagnetic theory, we call $\tilde{A}$ and $\hat{A}$ the electric and magnetic parts of the gauge potential, respectively. Thus (4.6) and the assumption $\mathcal{A} = 0$ means that the gauge potential is purely magnetic. For solutions that are bounded at the origin, it can be shown by analyzing the initial value problem at $r = 0$ using the techniques [35, 36] that $\mathcal{A} = 0$ is a consequence of the EYM equations. Therefore no generality is lost by setting $\mathcal{A} = 0$ when looking for solutions that are bounded at $r = 0$. However, for black hole solutions it is known that there exists solutions with $\mathcal{A}$ not identically zero [13, 22]. Therefore $\mathcal{A} = 0$ is a restriction in this case.

With the above assumption, the gauge potential takes the form

$$A = \Lambda_1(r)d\theta + (\Lambda_2(r)\sin\theta + \Lambda_3\cos\theta)d\phi \,. \tag{4.7}$$

Using (4.1) and (4.7), the EYM equations reduce to

$$m' = (NG + r^{-2}P), \tag{4.8}$$
$$S^{-1}S' = 2r^{-1}G, \tag{4.9}$$
$$r^2 N\Lambda_+'' + 2(m - r^{-1}P)\Lambda_+' + \mathcal{F} = 0, \tag{4.10}$$
$$[\Lambda_+', \Lambda_-] + [\Lambda_-', \Lambda_+] = 0 \tag{4.11}$$

where $' := d/dr$ and

$$\Lambda_\pm := \mp\Lambda_1 - i\Lambda_2, \quad \Lambda_0 := 2i\Lambda_3, \tag{4.12}$$
$$N =: 1 - \frac{2m}{r}, \quad G := \tfrac{1}{2}\langle\, \Lambda_+' | \Lambda_+' \,\rangle \quad P := \tfrac{1}{2}\langle\, \hat{F} | \hat{F} \,\rangle, \tag{4.13}$$
$$\hat{F} := \tfrac{i}{2}(\Lambda_0 - [\Lambda_+, \Lambda_-]), \tag{4.14}$$
$$\mathcal{F} := -i[\hat{F}, \Lambda_+]. \tag{4.15}$$

Using the norm (2.1), G and P can can be written as

$$G = \tfrac{1}{2}\|\Lambda_+'\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad P = \tfrac{1}{2}\|\hat{F}\|^2 \tag{4.16}$$

and obviously $G \geq 0$ and $P \geq 0$. A useful variant of (4.8) is

$$N' = \frac{1}{r}\left(1 - N - 2NG - \frac{2}{r^2}P\right) \,. \tag{4.17}$$

Observe that equation (4.5) becomes

$$[\Lambda_0, \Lambda_\pm] = \pm 2\Lambda_\pm \,, \tag{4.18}$$

and Λ_0 satisfies

$$c(\Lambda_0) = -\Lambda_0 \,. \tag{4.19}$$

Defining

$$S_\lambda := \{\, \alpha \in R \,|\, \alpha(\Lambda_0) = 2 \,\} \tag{4.20}$$

it follows easily from (4.18) that

$$\Lambda_+(r) \in \bigoplus_{\alpha \in S_\lambda} \mathbb{C}\mathbf{e}_\alpha \quad \forall\, r \,. \tag{4.21}$$

Observe that if we define

$$V_n := \{\, X \in \mathfrak{g} \,|\, [\Lambda_0, X] = nX \,\} \,, \tag{4.22}$$

then

$$V_2 := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in S_\lambda} \mathbb{C}\mathbf{e}_\alpha \tag{4.23}$$

It is straightforward to verify that the stress-energy tensor T^a_b in the Schwarzschild coordinates is given by

$$T^a_b = \operatorname{diag}\left(-\frac{NG}{r^2} - \frac{P}{r^4}, \frac{NG}{r^2} - \frac{P}{r^4}, \frac{P}{r^4}, \frac{P}{r^4}\right)$$

So the energy density, radial and tangential pressure are given by

$$4\pi e = r^{-2}(NG + r^{-2}P), \quad 4\pi p_r = r^{-2}(NG - r^{-2}P), \quad \text{and} \quad 4\pi p_\theta = r^{-4}P, \tag{4.24}$$

respectively.

The magnetic and electric charges can be defined via

$$Q_E := \tfrac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathcal{S}^2_\infty} \left\|{*F_{ab}}\epsilon^{ab}\right\| \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad Q_M := \tfrac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathcal{S}^2_\infty} \left\|F_{ab}\epsilon^{ab}\right\| \epsilon\,.$$

where $\mathcal{S}^2_\infty$ is a sphere at ∞ and ϵ is the induced volume form on $\mathcal{S}^2_\infty$. Using (4.7), a short calculation shows that total magnetic and electric charges are given by

$$Q_M = \lim_{r\to\infty} \|\hat{F}(r)\| \quad \text{and} \quad Q_E = 0\,. \tag{4.25}$$

Following [5], we find it useful to introduce a new independent variable τ via

$$\frac{dr}{d\tau} = r\sqrt{N} \tag{4.26}$$

and dependent variables

$$\mu := \sqrt{N}, \quad U_+ := \sqrt{N}\Lambda'_+, \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa := \frac{1}{2\mu}(1 + \mu^2 + 2\mu^2 G - 2r^{-2}P)\,. \tag{4.27}$$

In these variables, equations (4.8)-(4.11) become

$$\dot{r} = r\mu\,, \tag{4.28}$$

$$\dot{\Lambda}_+ = rU_+\,, \tag{4.29}$$

$$\dot{\mu} = (\kappa - \mu)\mu - 2\mu^2 G\,, \tag{4.30}$$

$$(S\mu)^{\dot{}} = S(\kappa - \mu)\mu\,, \tag{4.31}$$

$$\dot{\kappa} = -\kappa^2 + 1 + 2\mu^2 G\,, \tag{4.32}$$

$$\dot{U}_+ = -(\kappa - \mu)U_+ - \frac{1}{r}\mathcal{F}\,, \tag{4.33}$$

where $\dot{(\cdot)} = \frac{d(\cdot)}{d\tau}$. One advantage of this system of equations over (4.8)-(4.11) is that it is no longer singular at $\mu = N^2 = 0$. However, this will not be important to us here. Instead, we shall exploit in section 9 the fact that the system (4.28)-(4.33) is asymptotically autonomous to determine the behaviour of bounded solutions as $r \to \infty$.

5 Restrictions on Λ_0

Spherical symmetry implies that Λ_0 must lie in the set $\frac{1}{2\pi i}\mathcal{I} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbb{R}}$. We shall now see how boundary conditions restrict Λ_0 to lie in an even smaller set. For the geometry to be regular at the origin, it is necessary that

$$\lim_{r\to 0} N(r) = 1\,. \tag{5.1}$$

For a global solution that is defined for all $r \in [0, \infty)$, the physical boundary conditions at the origin $r = 0$ are that the energy density and the radial and tangential pressures are finite there. From (4.24) and (5.1), is clear that these boundary conditions imply

$$G(r) = \mathrm{O}(r^2) \quad \text{and} \quad P(r) = \mathrm{O}(r^4) \quad \text{as } r \to 0\,. \tag{5.2}$$

An immediate consequence is

$$[\Lambda_+(0), \Lambda_-(0)] = \Lambda_0\,.$$

This result combined with (4.18) and (4.19) shows that $\{\Lambda_0, \Lambda_+(0), \Lambda_-(0)\}$ form a real standard triple. Thus $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \big(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\mathcal{I} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbb{R}}\big)$.

Lemma 5.1.

$$\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} = \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\mathcal{I} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbb{R}}\right)$$

Proof. Suppose $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathcal{W}$. Then $2\pi i\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Moreover, $\exp(2\pi i\Omega_0) = 1 \in G$ as Ω_0 is the neutral element of a $\mathfrak{sl}_2\mathbb{C}$ subalgebra and $2\pi i\Lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}_0$. Therefore $\Omega_0 \in \frac{1}{2\pi i}\mathcal{I} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and hence

$$\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} \subset \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\mathcal{I} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbb{R}}\right)\,.$$

The reverse inclusion is simple to establish and will be left to the reader. □

This lemma shows that with the above boundary conditions at the origin $r = 0$, we can assume that

$$\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}\,. \tag{5.3}$$

As we remarked before, the assumption that the spacetime is asymptotically flat implies that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} N(r) = \lim_{r\to\infty} S(r) = 1\,. \tag{5.4}$$

A common boundary condition that is adopted at $r = \infty$ is that the total magnetic charge vanishes. The vanishing of the total magnetic charge is equivalent to

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \hat{F} = 0 \tag{5.5}$$

by (4.25). Assuming the limit $\lim_{r\to\infty} \Lambda_+(r)$ exists, 5.5 implies

$$[\Lambda_+(\infty), \Lambda_-(\infty)] = \Lambda_0$$

where $\Lambda_+(\infty) = \lim_{r\to\infty} \Lambda_+(r)$. The same argument as above shows that $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$. Therefore, if the magnetic charge vanishes, then we can assume that $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$.

The condition (5.5) does not seem to be a necessary one as purely magnetic black hole solutions have been constructed numerically with nonzero magnetic charge [22]. However, for globally regular solutions defined on $[0, \infty)$ it is unknown if this condition is necessary. Indeed, as we shall see in section 7 for certain choices of $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$, it is not clear that the limit $\lim_{r\to\infty} \Lambda_+(r)$ actually exists, and even if it does exists we have not been able to prove that (5.5) is automatically satisfied. With this said, we will for the remainder of the article assume that 5.3 holds.

6 Regular A_1-vectors and Π-systems

If $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathcal{W}$ then we call Λ_0 a *regular A_1-vector* and the action of $SU(2)$ determined by Λ_0 will be called a *regular action*. Previous to our work in [36], all the results in the literature concerning the EYM equations have be derived under the assumption that Λ_0 is regular. There are two main reasons for this assumption. First, equation (4.11) can be solved exactly and secondly the remaining equations (4.8)-(4.10) can be expanded out in a Chevalley-Weyl basis $\{\, \mathbf{h}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Delta \,\} \cup \{\, \mathbf{e}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in R \,\}$ without having to explicitly compute any of the brackets $[\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_\beta]$. As we shall see below, this simplification can be traced back to the fact that S_λ is a Π-*system* whenever Λ_0 is regular. So in fact the simplification is not dependent on Λ_0 being regular but only on S_λ being a Π-system. We recall [12] that a subset $\Sigma \subset R$ is called a Π-*system* if and only if

(i) if $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma$ then $\alpha - \beta \notin R$

(ii) Σ is linearly independent

For a proof of the fact that Λ_0 regular implies that S_λ is a Π-system see [7].

If we assume that S_λ is a Π-system, then $\{\, \mathbf{h}_\alpha\, ,\, \mathbf{e}_\alpha\, ,\, \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha} \mid \alpha \in S_\lambda \,\}$ generates a semisimple Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ denoted $\mathfrak{g}_\lambda$ for which S_λ is a base [12]. By the definition of S_λ, it is clear that Λ_0 is a principal A_1-vector in $\mathfrak{g}_\lambda$. Also from (4.21) and the definition of $\mathfrak{g}_\lambda$, we see that $\Lambda_+(r) \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda$ for all r. The above discussion shows that if $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ is chosen so that S_λ is a Π-system, then the field equations (4.8)-(4.11) can be reduced to a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ for which Λ_0 is a principal. Therefore, when S_λ is a Π-system we can, without loss of generality, assume that Λ_0 is a principal A_1-vector in $\mathfrak{g}$.

So assume now that $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ is principal. We have the expansion

$$\Lambda_+(r) = \sum_{\alpha \in S_\lambda} w_\alpha(r) \mathbf{e}_\alpha\ , \tag{6.1}$$

by (4.21) where the $w_\alpha(r)$ are complex valued functions and $\Delta = S_\lambda$. From (2.9) and (4.12) it follows that

$$\Lambda_-(r) = \sum_{\alpha \in S_\lambda} \bar{w}_\alpha(r) \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha}\ . \tag{6.2}$$

Substituting (6.1) and (6.2) into (4.11) and using (2.10)-(2.12) yields

$$w_\alpha \bar{w}'_\alpha = w'_\alpha \bar{w}_\alpha \quad \forall\ \alpha \in S_\lambda \tag{6.3}$$

since α, $\beta \in S_\lambda$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$ implies that $\alpha - \beta \notin R$. Solving equation (6.3) shows that w_α must have constant phase. We are free to choose these phases, which amounts to a choice of gauge, and so we demand that the phases are all zero. Hence the $w_\alpha(r)$ are all real valued functions. We can substitute (6.1) and (6.2) into (4.8) and (4.10) to get

$$m' = (NG + r^{-2}P), \tag{6.4}$$

$$r^2 N w''_\alpha + 2(m - r^{-1}P) w'_\alpha + \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{\beta \in S_\lambda} w_\alpha C_{\alpha\beta}(\lambda_\beta - w_\beta^2) = 0 \tag{6.5}$$

where $(C_{\alpha\beta}) := (\langle\alpha,\beta\rangle)$ is the Cartan matrix of the reduced structure group, and

$$P = \tfrac{1}{8} \sum_{\alpha,\beta\in S_\lambda} (\lambda_\alpha - w_\alpha^2) h_{\alpha\beta} (\lambda_\beta - w_\beta^2)\,, \tag{6.6}$$

$$G = \sum_{\alpha\in S_\lambda} \frac{{w'_\alpha}^2}{|\alpha|^2}\,, \tag{6.7}$$

$$h_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{2C_{\alpha\beta}}{|\alpha|^2}\,, \tag{6.8}$$

and

$$\lambda_\alpha = 2 \sum_{\beta\in S_\lambda} (C^{-1})_{\alpha\beta}\,. \tag{6.9}$$

As before, in deriving the above expression we have used α, $\beta \in S_\lambda$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$, implies $\alpha - \beta \notin R$. On the other hand, if S_λ is not a Π-system then equation (4.11) can no longer be solved exactly. This is due to the fact that for α,$\beta \in R$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$ it is no longer necessary that $\alpha - \beta \notin R$. This implies in particular that the bracket $[\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_\beta]$ may no longer be zero. The inability to solve (4.11) implies that the system of equations (4.8)-(4.11) can no longer be written in the standard form $y'(r) = f(y(r), r)$ which provides a serious complication. Also the non-vanishing of the brackets $[\mathbf{e}_\alpha, \mathbf{e}_\beta]$ greatly increases the complexity of the equations.

In view of the above discussion, it would be desirable to classify all those $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ for which S_λ is a Π-system. Suppose $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ is such that S_λ is a Π-system. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_j \mathfrak{g}^j$ denote the decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$ into simple ideals and $R^j \subset R$ denote the roots of $\mathfrak{g}^j$. This determines a decomposition of $S_\lambda = \dot{\cup} S_\lambda^j$ into a disjoint union of sets $S_\lambda^j \subset R^j$ such that S_λ^j is a Π-system in $\mathfrak{g}^j$. Moreover, if we let $\Lambda_0 = \sum_i \Lambda_0^j$ denote the corresponding decomposition of Λ_0 then it is not difficult to show that $S_\lambda^j = \{\, \alpha \in R^j \,|\, \alpha(\Lambda_0^j) = 2 \,\}$ and $\Lambda_0^j \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}^j) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}(\mathfrak{g}^j)$. This proves that if we can parametrize the set $\{\, \Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} \,|\ S_\lambda$ is a Π-system$\}$ for simple Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}$ then we can parametrize it for all semisimple Lie algebras. The next theorem provides such a parametrization for the simple Lie algebras.

Theorem 6.1.

$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_n\mathbb{C}$
S_λ *is a* Π*-system if and only if the partition* $\mathbf{d}$ *that determines* Λ_0 *satisfies one of the following*

(i) $\mathbf{d} = (2v, 2u+1)$ *with* $2v > 2u+1 \geq 3$,

(ii) $\mathbf{d} = (2u+1, 2v)$ *with* $2u+1 > 2v \geq 2$,

(iii) $\mathbf{d} = (2v, 1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ *with* $v \geq 1$.

$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}\mathbb{C}$

S_λ *is a* Π*-system if and only if the partition* $\mathbf{d}$ *that determines* Λ_0 *satisfies one of the following*

(i) $\mathbf{d} = (2u+1)$ *with* $u \geq 1$,

(ii) $\mathbf{d} = (2u+1, 2v, 2v)$ *with* $u \geq 1$, *and* $2u+1 > 2v$,

(iii) $\mathbf{d} = (2v, 2v, 2u+1)$ *with* $u \geq 1$ *and* $2v > 2u+1$,

(iv) $\mathbf{d} = (2v, 2v, 1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ *with* $v \geq 1$.

$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}_{2n}\mathbb{C}$

S_λ *is a* Π*-system if and only if the partition* $\mathbf{d}$ *that determines* Λ_0 *is of the form* $\mathbf{d} = (2v, 1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ *where* $v \geq 1$.

$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}_{2n}\mathbb{C}$

S_λ *is a* Π*-system if and only if the partition* $\mathbf{d}$ *that determines* Λ_0 *satisfies one of the following*

(i) $\mathbf{d} = (u, u)$ *with* $u \geq 1$,

(ii) $\mathbf{d} = (2u + 1, 1)$ *with* $u \geq 1$,

(iii) $\mathbf{d} = (2u + 1, 2v, 2v, 1)$ *with* $2u + 1 > 2v \geq 2$,

(iv) $\mathbf{d} = (2v, 2v, 2u + 1, 1)$ *with* $2v > 2u + 1 \geq 1$,

(v) $\mathbf{d} = (2v, 2v, 2u + 1, 2u + 1)$ *with* $2v > 2u + 1 \geq 3$,

(vi) $\mathbf{d} = (2u + 1, 2u + 1, 2v, 2v)$ *with* $2u + 1 > 2v \geq 2$.

S_λ *is a* Π*-system if and only if the characteristic* χ *that determines* Λ_0 *is equal to*

(a) (2^6), $(2, 1^2, 0, 1, 2)$ *or* $(0, 1, 0^4)$ *for* $\mathfrak{g} = E_6$,

(b) (2^7) *or* $(2, 1, 2, 1, 0, 1, 2)$ *for* $\mathfrak{g} = E_7$,

(c) (2^8), $(2, 1, 2^2, 1, 0, 1, 2)$ *or* $(0^7, 1)$ *for* $\mathfrak{g} = E_8$,

(d) (2^4), $(1, 0, 1, 2)$ *or* $(1, 0^3)$ *for* $\mathfrak{g} = F_4$,

(e) (2^2), $(1, 0)$ *or* $(0, 1)$ *for* $\mathfrak{g} = G_2$.

Proof. From section 3, we know that the sets $\mathcal{A}_1^{\vee} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ can be completely parametrized for the simple Lie algebras. Since $\mathcal{A}_1^{\vee} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} = \mathcal{A}_1^{\vee,\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ by lemma 3.1, we can use this parametrization to determine all the $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\vee} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ such that S_λ is a Π-system. For the exceptional algebras this can be done by straightforward calculations using the tables in chapter 8 of [10]. For the classical algebras, we will only prove the theorem for simplest case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_n\mathbb{C}$. The other algebras $\mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}\mathbb{C}$, $\mathfrak{so}_{2n}\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}\mathbb{C}$ can be analyzed in a similar fashion using the formulas from chapter 5 of [10]. However, due to the increase in complexity of the formulas over those for $\mathfrak{sl}_n\mathbb{C}$, the proofs become much more difficult and tedious.

To proceed, let $\mathfrak{D}$ denote the set of diagonal $n \times n$ complex matricies. Then

$$\mathfrak{h} = \{\, H \in \mathfrak{D} \mid \mathrm{trace}(H) = 0 \,\}$$

is a Cartan subalgebra for $\mathfrak{sl}_n\mathbb{C}$. Define $\epsilon_j \in \mathfrak{D}^*$ by

$$\epsilon_j(\mathrm{diag}(H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_n)) = H_j \,.$$

The set of roots determined by $\mathfrak{h}$ is $R = \{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j | 1 \leq i, j \leq n \quad i \neq j\}$ and $\Delta = \{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j | j = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1\,\}$ is a base for R. Suppose Λ_0 is the A_1-vector determined by the partition $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k)$ according to the formulas (3.10) and (3.11).

Lemma 6.2. *If there exists $r, s \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ with $r < s$ such that d_r and d_s are both even, then S_λ is not a Π-system.*

Proof. Since d_r and d_s are both even, and $r < s$, it follows that $d_r \geq d_s \geq 2$. Let $\hat{d}_j := \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} d_i$, $I = \hat{d}_r + d_r/2$, and $J = \hat{d}_s + d_s/2$. Then it is not difficult to verify that $\epsilon_I - \epsilon_{I+1}$ and $\epsilon_I - \epsilon_{J+1}$ are in S_λ. But $(\epsilon_I - \epsilon_{I+1}) - (\epsilon_I - \epsilon_{J+1}) = \epsilon_{J+1} - \epsilon_{I+1} \in R$ and hence S_λ is not a Π-system by definition. $\square$

Lemma 6.3. *If there exists $r, s \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ with $r < s$ such that d_r and d_s are both odd and $d_r > 1$, then S_λ is not a Π-system.*

Proof. Since $r < s$, d_r and d_s are odd, and $d_r > 1$, we must have $d_r \geq 3$ and $d_r \geq d_s$. Let $I = \hat{d}_r + (d_r - 1)/2$ and $J = \hat{d}_s + (d_s - 1)/2$ with $\hat{d}_j$ defined as in lemma 6.2. Then it is easy to show that $\epsilon_I - \epsilon_{I+1}$ and $\epsilon_I - \epsilon_{J+1}$ are in S_λ. But then $(\epsilon_I - \epsilon_{I+1}) - (\epsilon_I - \epsilon_{J+1}) = \epsilon_{J+1} - \epsilon_{I+1} \in R$ and hence S_λ is not a Π-system by definition. $\square$

From these two lemmas it is clear that the only possibilities left for a partition $\mathbf{d}$ to give rise to a S_λ that is a Π-system is if $\mathbf{d}$ satisfies (i), (ii), or (iii) from the statement of the theorem. It can be verified that each of these leads to a S_λ that is a Π-system. We will only verify the case (i). Now, straightforward computation shows that $S_\lambda = \{\, \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1} \,|\, i = 1, \ldots, d_1 - 1 \} \cup \{\, \epsilon_{d_1+i} - \epsilon_{d_1+i+1} \,|\, i = 1, \ldots, d_2 - 1 \,\}$. Thus $S_\lambda \subset \Delta$ which implies that S_λ is a Π-system. $\square$

Corollary 6.4. *For the simple algebras B_ℓ, C_ℓ, D_ℓ, G_2, F_4, E_6, E_7, E_8, and $A_{\ell'}$ with ℓ' odd, the only regular A_1-vector is the the principal one. For ℓ' even, the regular A_1-vectors are classified by partitions of the form $\mathbf{d} = (\ell' + 1 - k, k)$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell'/2$.*

Proof. The statements concerning the classical simple algebras A_ℓ, B_ℓ, C_ℓ, and D_ℓ can be verified using theorem 6.4 and the formulas from chapter 5 of [10]. For the the exceptional algebras G_2, F_4, E_6, E_7, and E_8, the conclusion follows immediately from theorem 6.1. $\square$

We know from lemma 3.1 that $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} = \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$. But it is also clear from theorem 6.1 and the discussion in section 3 that if we let $\mathcal{M}_\Pi := \{\, \Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} \,|\; S_\lambda \text{ is a } \Pi\text{-system} \}$ then $|\mathcal{M}_\Pi| \ll |\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}|$. Therefore $|\mathcal{M}_\Pi| \ll |\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}|$ and we conclude that the regular models are rare.

7 Global behavior

In the papers [35, 36], we established that the EYM equations are locally solvable near the origin $r = 0$ and a black hole horizon $r = r_H$. If any of these local solutions could be continued out to $r = \infty$, we would like to know its behavior. Knowing the global behavior is important for two reasons. The first is that numerical solutions can be constructed much more efficiently when one knows what to expect. The second is that we believe that these global estimates will be necessary in proving the existence of global solutions as was the case when $G = SU(2)$ [5, 16, 48] and more recently $G = SU(3)$ [39].

Suppose that $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ is a bounded solution to (4.8), (4.10), and (4.11) in a neighborhood of $r = r_*$ where $r_* = 0$ or $r_* = r_H > 0$. We are interested in the local solutions that can be continued out to $r = \infty$ with $N(r) > 0$ for $r > r_*$. For the moment we will assume that there exists a $r_0 > r_*$ so that the conditions

$$N(r_0) < 1, \quad \|\Lambda_+(r)\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|\Lambda_0\| \,, \tag{7.1}$$

and

$$[\Lambda'_+(r_0), \Lambda_-(r_0)] + [\Lambda'_-(r_0), \Lambda_+(r_0)] = 0, \tag{7.2}$$

are satisfied. At the end of section 10 we will show that all local solutions that can be continued out to $r = \infty$ with $N(r) > 0$ for $r > r_*$ will necessarily have to satisfy these conditions. Before we state the main theorem that characterizes the global behavior, we first need to introduce a technical condition. The space V_2 (see (4.23)) is uniquely determined by the choice of Λ_0 in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$. Therefore the bilinear form

$$B : V_2 \times V_2 \longrightarrow V_2 \;:\; (X,Y) \longmapsto [X, c(Y)]\,. \tag{7.3}$$

depends implicitly on Λ_0. Our results require that Λ_0 is chosen so that the following coercive condition is satisfied

$$\frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2} \leq \inf_{X \in V_2 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|B(X,X)\|^2}{\|X\|^4}\,. \tag{7.4}$$

We show in the next section that there exists Λ_0 in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ for which the inequality (7.4) is satisfied. In fact we have some evidence that (7.4) is satisfied for all Λ_0 in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ although we have no proof of this fact.

To state our main result we must first recall from [35] that given a vector $\Omega_+ \in V_2$ such that $\{\Lambda_0, \Omega_+, \Omega_- := -c(\Omega_+)\}$ forms a real standard triple then the $\mathbb{R}$-linear operator $\mathrm{A} : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}$ defined by

$$\mathrm{A} := \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{ad}(\Omega_+) \circ (\mathrm{ad}(\Omega_-) + \mathrm{ad}(\Omega_+) \circ c)$$

preserves the subspace V_2 and is diagonalizable. The space V_2 then decomposes into

$$V_2 = E_0 \oplus E_+$$

where $E_0 := \ker \mathrm{A}|_{V_2}$ and E_+ is the direct sum of all the eigenspaces with positive eigenvalues.

We now state our main result:

Theorem 7.1. *Suppose $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{v,\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ is such that the inequality (7.4) is satisfied. If $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ is a solution to equations (4.8) and (4.10) defined on $[r_0, \infty)$ $(r_0 > 0)$ that satisfies*

$$N(r_0) < 1\,, \quad \|\Lambda_+(r_0)\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|\Lambda_0\|\,, \quad [\Lambda'_+(r_0), \Lambda_-(r_0)] + [\Lambda'_-(r_0), \Lambda_+(r_0)] = 0\,,$$

at the point r_0 and

$$N(r) > 0 \textit{ for all } r \geq r_0,$$

then

- *(i) there exist a $m_\infty > 0$ such that $m(r) \to m_\infty$ as $r \to \infty$,*
- *(ii) $0 < N(r) < 1$ for all $r \geq r_0$,*
- *(iii) equation (4.11) is automatically satisfied for all $r \geq r_0$,*
- *(iv) equation (4.9) can be integrated to obtain $S(r)$ and $S(r_0)$ can be chosen so that $S(r) \to 1$ as $r \to \infty$,*

(v) $\|\Lambda_+(r)\| \leq \|\Lambda_0\|/\sqrt{2}$ *for all* $r \geq r_0$,

(vi) $r\Lambda_+'(r) \to 0$ *and* $\|\Lambda_+(r) - \mathfrak{F}^\times\| \to 0$ *as* $r \to \infty$,

where

$$\mathfrak{F}^\times := \{\, X \in V_2 \setminus \{0\} \mid [[c(X), X], X] = 2X \,\}.$$

Moreover if S_λ *is a* Π*-system then* $\Lambda_+(r) \in E_+$ *for all* $r \geq r_0$ *and* $\lim_{r\to\infty} \Lambda_+(r) = \Omega_+^\infty$ *for some* $\Omega_+^\infty \in \mathfrak{F}^\times \cap E_+$.

When Λ_0 is such that S_λ is a Π-system, this theorem is a natural generalization of the $SU(2)$ results. However, if S_λ is not a Π-system, then there is a possibility for a new type of behavior as (vi) leaves open the possibility that $\Lambda_+(r)$ does not actually approach a limit as $r \to \infty$. The reason that this possibility exists is that when S_λ is not a Π-system $\mathfrak{F}^\times$ forms a $|S_\lambda|$-dimensional real variety. On the other hand, the existence of the limit $\Lambda_+(r)$ as $r \to \infty$ when S_λ is a Π-system is due to the fact that the set $\mathfrak{F}^\times \cap E_+$ is discrete (see lemma 8.2).

From the definition of $\mathfrak{F}^\times$, it is clear that every $X_+ \in \mathfrak{F}^\times$ determines a real standard triple $\{X_0, X_-, X_+\}$ where $X_- := -c(X_+)$ and $X_0 := [X_+, X_-]$. For a given $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$, we know that there exist an $\Omega_+ \in V_2$ such that $\{\Lambda_0, \Omega_+, \Omega_-\}$ ($\Omega_- := -c(\Omega_+)$) is a real standard triple. Let

$$\mathfrak{E} := \{\, \Omega_+ \in V_2 \setminus \{0\} \mid [c(\Omega_+), \Omega_+] = \Lambda_0 \,\}.$$

Then $\mathfrak{E} \subset \mathfrak{F}^\times$, and it follows from (4.25) that the magnetic charge $Q_M \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$ if and only if $\|\Lambda_+(r) - \mathfrak{E}\| \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$. Therefore $\mathfrak{F}^\times \setminus \mathfrak{E}$ characterizes the asymptotic values of $\Lambda_+(r)$ for which the magnetic charge does not vanish. If $G = SU(2)$ then $\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{F}^\times$ and so we recover the known fact that the global solutions cannot have any magnetic charge. For $G \neq SU(2)$, in general $\mathfrak{E}$ is a proper subset of $\mathfrak{F}^\times$ and hence there exist a possibility for solutions with magnetic charge. As we mentioned earlier in section 5, purely magnetic black hole solutions with nonzero magnetic charge have been found numerically [22]. However, it is not clear if solitons with nonzero magnetic charge exist. No numerical solutions of this type have been found. Assuming that $\lim_{r\to\infty} \Lambda_+(r)$ exists, the initial value problem at $r = \infty$ may provide some insight. For $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_n\mathbb{C}$ and Λ_0 principal, the possiblility of magnetic charge has been studied in [26]. To describe these results, we first expand $\Lambda_+(r)$ as (see (6.1))

$$\Lambda_+(r) = \sum_{\alpha \in S_\lambda} w_\alpha(r)\mathbf{e}_\alpha\ ,$$

where the w_α are real valued functions. We note this expansion is possible since Λ_0 is regular. If the magnetic charge does not vanish, then it can be shown that $\lim_{r\to\infty} w_\alpha(r) = 0$ for some of the $\alpha \in S_\lambda$. Assuming analyticity of the solution about $r = \infty$, the power series expansion then shows that $w_\alpha = 0$ for r near $r = \infty$. We expect , although we have no proof, that $w_\alpha = 0$ near $r = \infty$ actually implies that $w_\alpha = 0$ for all r. For black hole solutions this is not a problem. In fact the magnetically charged black hole solutions of [22] were found by setting $w_\alpha = 0$ for certain $\alpha \in S_\lambda$. But for solitons, $w_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in S_\lambda$ is not compatible with the boundary conditions at $r = 0$. This may explain why no magnetically charged solitons have been found. Our analysis of the initial value problem at $r = \infty$ [35, 36] has been done under the assumption that $\lim_{r\to\infty} \Lambda_+(r) \in \mathfrak{E}$. In view of the above discussion, it would be desirable to generalize the existence and uniqueness proof at $r = \infty$ to allow for $\lim_{r\to\infty} \Lambda_+(r)$ in $\mathfrak{F}^\times$.

It was observed in [36] that the existence proof for the gauge group $SU(2)$ can be used to imply the existence of global solutions for any compact gauge group and any generator Λ_0 in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$. This of course leaves open the question of what are all the possible global solutions. The rest of this article will be spent proving theorem 7.1.

8 A coercive condition

In this section we show that there exist Λ_0 in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ so that (7.4) is satisfied. To start, we first derive an inequality that is equivalent to (7.4) but easier to work with. Let

$$S(V_2) := \{ \, Y \in V_2 \mid \|Y\| = 1 \, \}$$

and define

$$\mathcal{J} := \{ \, X \in S(V_2) \mid [[c(X), X], X] = \|[X, c(X)]\|^2 \, X \, \}$$

Lemma 8.1.

$$\inf_{X \in \mathcal{J}} \|B(X,X)\|^2 = \inf_{X \in V_2 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|B(X,X)\|^2}{\|X\|^4}$$

Proof. Define

$$Q(Y) := B(Y,Y)^2 \, ,$$

and let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the set of critical points of $Q|_{S(V_2)}$. Then it is clear that

$$\inf_{X \in \mathcal{C}} \|B(X,X)\|^2 = \inf_{X \in V_2 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|B(X,X)\|^2}{\|X\|^4} \, .$$

Therefore to prove the theorem we need to show that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{C}$. So suppose X is a critical point of $Q|_{S(V_2)}$ and let $f(Y) := \|Y\|^4$. By the method of Lagrange multipliers there exists a $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$DQ(X) = \beta Df(X) \, .$$

Straightforward calculation shows that

$$Df(Z) \cdot Y = 4 \|Z\|^2 \langle\langle \, Z | Y \, \rangle\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad DQ(Z) \cdot Y = -4 \langle\langle \, [[Z, c(Z)], Z] | Y \, \rangle\rangle \, .$$

Therefore X must satisfy

$$\|X\| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad [[c(X), X], X] = \beta X \, . \tag{8.1}$$

Taking the norm on both sides of $[[c(X), X], X] = \beta X$ and using $\|X\| = 1$ yields

$$\beta = \langle\langle \, [[c(X), X], X] | X \, \rangle\rangle = \|[c(X), X]\|^2 \, . \tag{8.2}$$

Let $X_+ := X$, $X_- := -c(X)$, and $X_0 := [X_+, X_-]$. Then $[X_0, X_\pm] = \pm \|X_0\|^2 X_\pm$ by (8.1) and (8.2). This proves that $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{J}$. The reverse inclusion is straightforward to verify. □

Define

$$\mathfrak{F} := \{ \, X \in V_2 \mid [[c(X), X], X] = 2X \, \} \tag{8.3}$$

At this point we will prove a result about the structure of $\mathfrak{F}$ that will be required later on. This result will not be used in this section.

Lemma 8.2. *If S_λ is a Π-system, then $\mathfrak{F} \cap E_+$ is a discrete set.*

Proof. Proposition 4 in [35] shows that $E_+ = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{R}\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_j}$, so we can expand $X_+ \in E_+$ as

$$X_+ = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} x_j \mathbf{e}_{\alpha_j}$$

where $x_j \in \mathbb{R}$. So

$$X_- := -c(X_+) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} x_j \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha_j}$$

and hence

$$X_0 := [X_+, X_-] = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell}\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} x_j x_k [\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_j}, \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha_k}] = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} x_j^2 \mathbf{h}_{\alpha_j}$$

as $[\mathbf{e}_{\alpha_j}, \mathbf{e}_{-\alpha_k}] = \delta_{jk}\mathbf{h}_{\alpha_j}$. Using $[\mathbf{h}_{\alpha_j}, \mathbf{e}_{\pm\alpha_k}] = \pm C_{kj}\mathbf{e}_{\pm\alpha_k}$ where C_{kj} is the Cartan matrix of $\mathfrak{g}_\lambda$, we get

$$[X_0, X_\pm] \mp 2X_\pm = \pm \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} C_{kj} x_j^2 - 2 \right) x_k \mathbf{e}_{\pm\alpha_k} \ .$$

Because the vectors $\mathbf{e}_{\pm\alpha_j}$ are linearly independent, it is clear that $X_+ \in \mathfrak{F} \cap E_+$ if and only if

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} C_{kj} x_j^2 - 2 \right) x_k = 0 \qquad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \ldots \ell.$$

Using the invertibility of the Cartan matrix C, the above equation can be solved to give

$$x_k = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad x_k = \pm \left(2 \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} (C^{-1})_{kj} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \qquad k = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell \ .$$

This solution set is obviously finite and therefore the proof is complete. $\square$

Define

$$\mathfrak{F}^\times := \mathfrak{F} \backslash \{0\}. \tag{8.4}$$

Lemma 8.3.

$$\inf_{X \in \mathcal{J}} \|B(X,X)\|^2 = \inf_{X \in \mathfrak{F}^\times} \frac{4}{\|B(X,X)\|^2}$$

Proof. Suppose $X_+ \in \mathcal{J}$. Let $X_- := -c(X_+)$ and $X_0 := [X_+, X_-]$. Then

$$2\|X_+\|^2 = \langle\langle\, 2X_+ | X_+ \,\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle\, [X_0, X_+] | X_+ \,\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle\, X_0 | [c(X_+), X_+] \,\rangle\rangle = \|X_0\|^2 \ . \tag{8.5}$$

Also note that if $X \in V_2$ and $[c(X), X] = 0$ then

$$0 = \langle\langle\, [c(X), X] | \Lambda_0 \,\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle\, X | [X, \Lambda_0] \,\rangle\rangle = -2\|X\|^2 \ .$$

Therefore

$$\text{if } X \in V_2 \text{ then } [c(X), X] = 0 \text{ if and only if } X = 0. \tag{8.6}$$

Define a map

$$\hat{}: \mathcal{J} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{F}^{\times}$$

by

$$X_+ \longmapsto \hat{X}_+ := \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\|[c(X_+), X_+\|} \, X_+ \, .$$

Then using (8.5) and (8.6), it is straightforward to verify that the above map is well defined and bijective. The proof now follows since

$$\|B(X_+, X_+)\|^2 = \frac{\|B(\hat{X}_+, \hat{X}_+)\|^2}{\|\hat{X}_+\|^4} \, ,$$

and

$$\frac{\|B(\hat{X}_+, \hat{X}_+)\|^2}{\|\hat{X}_+\|^4} = \frac{4}{\|B(\hat{X}_+, \hat{X}_+)\|^2}$$

by (8.5) and the fact that $\|B(\hat{X}_+, \hat{X}_+)\| = \|X_0\|$. $\square$

The above two lemmas show that the coercive condition (7.4) is equivalent to

$$\frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2} \leq \inf_{X \in \mathfrak{F}^{\times}} \frac{4}{\|B(X, X)\|^2} \, . \tag{8.7}$$

We will now show that there exist generators Λ_0 in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\text{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ that satisfy the inequality (7.4).

Theorem 8.4. *If S_λ is a Π-system then the inequality* (7.4) *is satisfied.*

Proof. Since S_λ is a Π-system, the discussion in section 6 shows that we can without loss of generality assume that Λ_0 is a principal A_1-vector. Note that if $X_+ \in \mathfrak{F}$ then $X_0 := [X_+, X_-] \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\text{v}}$ where $X_- := -c(X_+)$. Also note that since X_0 satisfies $c(X_0) = -c(X_0)$ it follows from the definition of $\|\cdot\|$ and B that $(X_0|X_0) = \|B(X_+, X_+)\|$. Therefore

$$\inf_{X \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\text{v}}} \frac{4}{(X|X)} \leq \inf_{X \in \mathfrak{F}^{\times}} \frac{4}{\|B(X, X)\|^2} \, , \tag{8.8}$$

as it can be easily shown that $(X|X) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $X \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\text{v}}$.

Lemma 8.5. *If $Y_0 \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\text{v}}$ then $(Y_0|Y_0) \leq \|\Lambda_0\|^2$.*

Proof. Since Λ_0 is principal, there exists a base Δ such that

$$\alpha(\Lambda_0) = 2 \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Delta. \tag{8.9}$$

Also there exists an automorphism ϕ of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that

$$\alpha(\phi(Y_0)) = 0, \, 1, \text{ or } 2 \text{ for every } \alpha \in \Delta. \tag{8.10}$$

Now

$$\Lambda_0 = \sum_{\alpha\in\Delta} \lambda_\alpha \mathbf{h}_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(Y_0) = \sum_{\alpha\in\Delta} y_\alpha \mathbf{h}_\alpha$$

where

$$\lambda_\alpha = 2\sum_{\beta\in\Delta}(C^{-1})_{\alpha\beta}\ , \quad y_\alpha = \sum_{\beta\in\Delta}(C^{-1})_{\alpha\beta}\, \beta(\phi(Y_0))$$

and C^{-1} is the inverse of the Cartan matrix $C = (\langle\alpha,\beta\rangle)$. Using the above expansions, it is easy to show that

$$(\Lambda_0|\Lambda_0) = 2\sum_{\alpha,\beta\in\Delta} \frac{4}{|\alpha|^2}(C^{-1})_{\alpha\beta}\ , \tag{8.11}$$

and

$$(Y_0|Y_0) = 2\sum_{\alpha,\beta\in\Delta} \frac{1}{|\alpha|^2}\alpha(\phi(Y_0))\,(C^{-1})_{\alpha\beta}\, \beta(\phi(Y_0))\ . \tag{8.12}$$

But $(C^{-1})_{\alpha\beta} \geq 0$ for all α, $\beta \in \Delta$. Therefore $(\phi(Y_0)|\phi(Y_0)) \leq (\Lambda_0|\Lambda_0)$ by (8.10), (8.11), and (8.12). Finally, observe that $(\phi(Y_0)|\phi(Y_0)) = (Y_0|Y_0)$ and $(\Lambda_0|\Lambda_0) = \|\Lambda_0\|^2$ since ϕ is an automorphism and $c(\Lambda_0) = -\Lambda_0$. Therefore $(Y_0|Y_0) \leq \|\Lambda_0\|^2$ and the proof is complete. $\square$

From this lemma and (8.8), we see that the inequality (8.7) is satisfied. By the above results this implies that (7.4) is also satisfied. $\square$

Since we now know that there exists Λ_0 in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ such that the inequality (7.4) is satisfied, it would be desirable to determine exactly which Λ_0 satisfy (7.4). In general, this appears to be a difficult question. However, for low dimensional Lie algebras, computations show that every Λ_0 in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathrm{v},\mathbb{R}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ satisfies (7.4). This gives some evidence to our belief that (7.4) is always satisfied. If this were the case, then our later proofs that rely on (7.4) would be general.

9 Asymptotic Yang-Mills equations

The flat space spherically symmetric Yang-Mills equations can be written as

$$\ddot{\Lambda}_+ - \dot{\Lambda}_+ + \mathcal{F} = 0 \tag{9.1}$$

where $\dot{(\cdot)} = \frac{d(\cdot)}{d\tau}$ and $\tau = \ln(r)$. However, for the purpose of this section we will consider equation (9.1) in its own right, and let τ denote a parameter that is not necessarily related to the radial coordinate r. We will be interested in $\tau \to \infty$ behavior of bounded solutions to equations of the form

$$\ddot{\Lambda}_+ - \dot{\Lambda}_+ + \mathcal{F} = \delta(\tau)\dot{\Lambda}_+\ , \tag{9.2}$$

where δ is any C^1 function that satisfies

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \delta(\tau) = 0\,. \tag{9.3}$$

To determine this behavior, we use the results of Markus [32] concerning the long time behavior of solutions to asymptotically autonomous differential equations. See also [33, 50]. To describe these results we first recall that a nonautonomous system of differential equations in $\mathbb{R}^N$

$$\dot{x}(\tau) = h(\tau, x(\tau)) \tag{9.4}$$

is said to be *asymptotically autonomous* with *limit equation*

$$\dot{y}(\tau) = g(y(\tau)) \tag{9.5}$$

if

$$h(\tau, x) \to g(x) \text{ as } \tau \to \infty \text{ uniformly on compact subsets of } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

We note that the maps h and g are assumed to be continuous and locally Lipschitz on $\mathbb{R}^N$. The ω-limit set $\omega(\tau_0, x_0)$ of a bounded solutions $x(\tau)$ to (9.4) on $[\tau_0, \infty)$ satisfying $x(\tau_0) = x_0$ is defined by

$$\omega(\tau_0, x_0) = \{\, y \,|\, y = \lim_{j\to\infty} x(\tau_j) \text{ for some sequence } \tau_j \to \infty \,\}\,.$$

The fundamental result of Markus is:

Theorem 9.1. *The ω-limit set $\omega(\tau_0, x_0)$ of a bounded solution $x(\tau)$ to* (9.4) *on $[\tau_0, \infty)$ satisfying $x(\tau_0) = x_0$ is nonempty, compact, and connected. Moreover,*

$$\operatorname{dist}(x(\tau), \omega(\tau_0, x_0)) \to 0 \text{ as } \tau \to \infty\,,$$

and $\omega(\tau_0, x_0)$ is invariant under (9.5).

Define maps

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}} : V_2 \longrightarrow V_2 \;:\; X \longmapsto \frac{1}{2}[\Lambda_0 + [X, c(X)], X]\,, \tag{9.6}$$

$$f : \mathbb{R} \times V_2 \times V_2 \longrightarrow V_2 \times V_2 \;:\; (\tau, X_1, X_2) \longmapsto (X_2, X_2 - \hat{\mathcal{F}}(X_1) + \delta(\tau)X_2)\,, \tag{9.7}$$

and

$$g : V_2 \times V_2 \longrightarrow V_2 \times V_2 \;:\; (\tau, X_1, X_2) \longmapsto (X_2, X_2 - \hat{\mathcal{F}}(X_1))\,. \tag{9.8}$$

Using these maps we can write (9.1) and (9.2) in first order form as

$$(\dot{\Lambda}_+, \dot{\Gamma}_+) = g(\Lambda_+, \Gamma_+) \tag{9.9}$$

and

$$(\dot{\Lambda}_+, \dot{\Gamma}_+) = f(\tau, \Lambda_+, \Gamma_+)\,, \tag{9.10}$$

respectively.

The proof of the next proposition is straightforward and left to the reader.

Proposition 9.2. *$f(\tau, X, Y) \longrightarrow g(X, Y)$ as $\tau \to \infty$ uniformly on compact subsets of $V_2 \times V_2$.*

This proposition shows that the nonautonomous system (9.10) is asymptotically autonomous with limit equation (9.9).

Proposition 9.3. *Suppose $\mathbf{X}(\tau) = (X_1(\tau), X_2(\tau))$ is a bounded solution to* (9.10) *that is defined for all $\tau \geq \tau_0$ and satisfies $\mathbf{X}(\tau_0) = \mathbf{X}_0$. Then*

(i) $\omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$ *is non-empty, compact and connected,*

(ii) $\|\mathbf{X}(\tau) - \omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0)\| \to 0$ *as* $\tau \to \infty$*,*

(iii) $\omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$ *is invariant under* (9.9)*.*

Proof. Follows directly from theorem 9.1 by proposition 9.2. □

Define

$$H : V_2 \times V_2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \,:\, (X_1, X_2) \longmapsto \frac{1}{2}\,\|X_2\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|\hat{F}(X_1)\|^2\,, \tag{9.11}$$

where

$$\hat{F}(X) := \frac{i}{2}(\Lambda_0 + [X, c(X)])\,. \tag{9.12}$$

Proposition 9.4. *If* $\mathbf{X}(\tau) = (X_1(\tau), X_2(\tau))$ *is a bounded solution to* (9.10)*, then there exists a* $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $H(\omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0)) = \beta$*.*

Proof. Straightforward calculation using (4.19), (4.22), the properties (2.2) of the inner product $\langle\langle\,\cdot|\cdot\,\rangle\rangle$, and (9.10) shows that

$$(H(\mathbf{X}(\tau))^{\cdot} = \|X_2(\tau)\|^2\,(1 + \delta(\tau))\,.$$

But $\delta(\tau) \to 0$ as $\tau \to \infty$, which shows that $(H(\mathbf{X}(\tau))^{\cdot} \geq 0$ for τ large enough. As $\mathbf{X}$ is bounded, $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} H(\mathbf{X}(\tau))$ exists and we denote the limit by β. Therefore for any sequence $\tau_k \to \infty$, we also have $\lim_{k\to\infty} H(\mathbf{X}(\tau_k)) = \beta$. By continuity of H, we have $H(\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{X}(\tau_k)) = \beta$. From the definition of $\omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$ it is clear that $H(\omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0)) = \beta$. □

The fixed points of (9.9) are

$$\mathfrak{F} \times \{0\} \tag{9.13}$$

where $\mathfrak{F}$ was previously defined in (8.3).

Theorem 9.5. *If* $\mathbf{X}(\tau) = (X_1(\tau), X_2(\tau))$ *is a bounded solution to* (9.10)*, then*

(i) $\|X_1(\tau) - \mathfrak{F}\| \to 0$ *as* $\tau \to \infty$

(ii) $X_2(\tau) \to 0$ *as* $\tau \to \infty$

Proof. Suppose $\mathbf{Y}_0 = (Y_{1,0}, Y_{2,0}) \in \omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$. Let $\mathbf{Y}(\tau) = (Y_1(\tau), Y_2(\tau))$ be a solution to (9.9) with $\mathbf{Y}(0) = \mathbf{Y}_0$. Then $\mathbf{Y}(\tau) \in \omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$ and $H(\mathbf{Y}(\tau)) = \beta$ for all $\tau \geq 0$ by propositions 9.3 and 9.4. Using (4.19), (4.22), the properties (2.2) of the inner product $\langle\langle\,\cdot|\cdot\,\rangle\rangle$, and (9.9), it is not difficult to show that $(H(\mathbf{Y}(\tau))^{\cdot} = \|Y_2(\tau)\|^2$. Therefore we must have $\|Y_2(\tau)\| = 0$ and hence $Y_2(\tau) = \dot{Y}_2(\tau) = 0$. It then follows form the differential equation (9.9) that $\dot{Y}_1(\tau) = 0$ and $[c(Y_1(\tau)), Y_1(\tau)] = 2Y_1(\tau)$. Therefore, $\mathbf{Y}(\tau) = (Y_{0,1}, 0)$ and $[c(Y_{1,0}), Y_{1,0}] = 2Y_{1,0}$. This proves that $\omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0) \subset \mathfrak{F} \times \{0\}$. The proof now follows easily since $\|\mathbf{X}(\tau) - \omega(\tau_0, \mathbf{X}_0)\| \to 0$ as $\tau \to \infty$ by proposition (9.3). □

Theorem 9.6. *If* $\mathbf{X}(\tau) = (X_1(\tau), X_2(\tau))$ *is a non trivial bounded solution to* (9.10)*, then*

(i) $\|X_1(\tau) - \mathfrak{F}^{\times}\| \to 0$ *as* $\tau \to \infty$

(ii) $X_2(\tau) \to 0$ *as* $\tau \to \infty$

Proof. If $\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\mathbf{X}(\tau)\neq 0$ then we are done by the above theorem. So assume that $\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\mathbf{X}(\tau)=0$. Let $W=V_2\times V_2$ and define a linear operator $\mathbb{T}$ on W by

$$\mathbb{T}(\mathbf{Z}):=\mathbf{D}g(0)\cdot\mathbf{Z}\,.$$

A short calculation shows that

$$\mathbb{T}=\begin{bmatrix}0 & \mathbb{1}\\ -\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1}\end{bmatrix}\,,$$

and that $\mathbb{T}$ has two distinct eigenvalues $(1\pm i\sqrt{3})/2$ each with multiplicity $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} V_2$. Therefore there exists constants K, $\alpha>0$ such that

$$\left|e^{-\tau\mathbb{T}}\right|\leq Ke^{-\alpha\tau}\quad\forall\,\tau\geq 0\,. \tag{9.14}$$

Choose $l>0$ so that

$$l<\frac{\alpha}{K}\,. \tag{9.15}$$

Because $g(0)=0$ and $\mathbf{D}g(0)=0$ it can be shown using appropriate smooth bump functions that for any $\mu>0$ there exists an $\epsilon>0$ and a C^∞ map $\hat{g}:W\to W$ such that

$$\|\hat{g}(\mathbf{Z}_1)-\hat{g}(\mathbf{Z}_2)\|\leq l\,\|\mathbf{Z}_1-\mathbf{Z}_2\|\quad\forall\,\mathbf{Z}_1,\mathbf{Z}_2\in W\,, \tag{9.16}$$

$$\|\hat{g}(\mathbf{Z})\|\leq\mu\quad\forall\mathbf{Z}\in W \tag{9.17}$$

and

$$\hat{g}(\mathbf{Z})=g(\mathbf{Z})-\mathbb{T}(\mathbf{Z})\quad\forall\,\mathbf{Z}\in B_\epsilon(W)\,. \tag{9.18}$$

Also because $\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\delta(\tau)=0$, there exists a τ_0 and a C^∞ function $\hat{\delta}(\tau)$ such that

$$|\hat{\delta}(\tau)|\leq l\quad\forall\tau\in\mathbb{R}\,, \tag{9.19}$$

and

$$\hat{\delta}(\tau)=\delta(\tau)\quad\forall\tau\geq\tau_0\,. \tag{9.20}$$

Letting $\mathrm{pr}_2:W\to V_2$ denote projection onto the second factor, it is clear from (9.18) and (9.20) that

$$f(\tau,\mathbf{Z})=\mathbb{T}(\mathbf{Z})+\hat{g}(\mathbf{Z})+\hat{\delta}(\tau)\mathrm{pr}_2(\mathbf{Z})\quad\forall\,\mathbf{Z}\in B_\epsilon(W),\ \tau\geq\tau_0\,. \tag{9.21}$$

Because $\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\mathbf{X}(\tau)=0$, there exists a $\tau_1>\tau_0$ such that $\mathbf{X}(\tau)\in B_\epsilon(W)$ for all $\tau\geq\tau_1$. So $\mathbf{X}(\tau)$ must be a solution to the differential equation

$$\dot{\mathbf{Y}}=\mathbb{T}(\mathbf{Y})+\hat{\delta}(\tau)\mathrm{pr}_2(\mathbf{Y})+\hat{g}(\mathbf{Y})$$

for $\tau\geq\tau_1$ by (9.21). Define

$$\mathbb{T}(t):=\mathbb{T}+\hat{\delta}(\tau)\mathrm{pr}_2 \tag{9.22}$$

so that Y satisfies

$$\dot{\mathbf{Y}}=\mathbb{T}(t)(\mathbf{Y})+\hat{g}(\mathbf{Y})\,. \tag{9.23}$$

Now $|\mathrm{pr}_2| \leq 1$ so $|\hat{\delta}(\tau)\mathrm{pr}_2| \leq l$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ by (9.19). Consequently,

$$\int_{\tau}^{\tau_0} |\hat{\delta}(s)\mathrm{pr}_2| ds \leq l(\tau_0 - \tau) \quad \forall \tau_0 \geq \tau \ . \tag{9.24}$$

Let $\Psi(\tau)$ be a fundamental matrix associated to $\mathbb{T}(\tau)$. In other words $\Psi(\tau)$ is an invertible matrix solution to

$$\dot{\Psi}(\tau) = \mathbb{T}(\tau)\Psi(\tau) \ .$$

It then follows by (9.14), (9.15), (9.24), and theorem 2.3 page 86 of [14] that $\Psi(\tau)$ satsifies

$$|\Psi(\tau)\Psi(\tau_0)^{-1}| \leq e^{-\alpha(\tau_0 - \tau)} \quad \forall\, \tau_0 \geq \tau \ . \tag{9.25}$$

The inequalities (9.16) and (9.17) guarantee that any solution of (9.23) is defined for all τ. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\tau)$ denote the unique global solution to (9.23) that satisfies $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\tau) = \mathbf{X}(\tau)$ for all $\tau \geq \tau_1$. Since $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \mathbf{X}(\tau) = 0$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\tau)$ is bounded on $[0, \infty)$. Notice, that because $\hat{g}(0) = g(0) = 0$, $Z(\tau) = 0$ is also a solution to (9.23). However, a slight generalization of lemma 1.5, page 54 of [17] shows that any solution to (9.23) bounded on $[0, \infty)$ is unique by (9.15), (9.16), (9.17), and (9.25). Therefore, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\tau) = 0$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and this implies that $\mathbf{X}(\tau) = 0$ for $\tau \geq \tau_1$. But $\mathbf{Z}(\tau) = 0$ is a solution to (9.10) and so $\mathbf{X}(\tau) = 0$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. This contradicts the assumption that $\mathbf{X}(\tau)$ is a non-trivial solution to (9.10). Therefore $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \mathbf{X}(\tau) \neq 0$. ☐

10 Global estimates

At the end of this section we prove theorem 7.1. However, we first need to prove a number of preliminary results.

Proposition 10.1. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to equations* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *defined on an interval* $[r_0, r_1)$ $(r_0 > 0)$ *and that satisfies* $N(r) > 0$ *for all* $r \geq r_0$ *and* $[\Lambda'_+(r_0), \Lambda_-(r_0)] + [\Lambda'_-(r_0), \Lambda_+(r_0)] = 0$ *then* Λ_+ *also satisfies* (4.11).

Proof. Lemma 1 of [36] shows that $\gamma(r) = [\Lambda_+(r), \Lambda'_-(r)] + [\Lambda_-(r), \Lambda'_+(r)]$ satisfies the differential equation $\gamma' = -\frac{2}{r^2 N}\left(m - \frac{1}{r}P\right)\gamma$. Integrating this equation yields

$$\gamma(r) = \gamma(r_0) \exp\left(\int_{r_0}^{r} -\frac{2}{s^2 N}\left(m - \frac{1}{s}P\right) ds\right) \ .$$

But $\gamma(r_0) = 0$ by assumptions, hence $\gamma(r) = 0$ for all $r \geq r_0$. ☐

Proposition 10.2. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to equations* (4.8) *and* (4.10), *that satisfies* $N(r_0) > 0$, $[\Lambda_+(r_0), \Lambda_-(r_0)] = \Lambda_0$, *and* $\Lambda'_+(r_0) = 0$ *for some* $r_0 > 0$, *then* $\Lambda_+(r) = \Lambda_+(r_0)$, $m(r) = \frac{r_0}{2}(1 - N(r_0))$, *and* $S(r) = S(r_0)$ *for all* $r > \max\{2m(r_0), 0\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward to check that if $N(r_0) > 0$, $[\Lambda_+(r_0), \Lambda_-(r_0)] = \Lambda_0$, and $\Lambda'_+(r_0) = 0$, then $\Lambda_+(r) := \Lambda_+(r_0)$ and $m(r) := \frac{r_0}{2}(1 - N(r_0))$ solve (4.8), (4.10), and (4.11). By standard uniqueness results for systems of differential equations, this is the only solution satisfying $N(r_0) > 0$, $[\Lambda_+(r_0), \Lambda_-(r_0)] = \Lambda_0$, and $\Lambda'_+(r_0) = 0$. ☐

The next two propositions generalize propositions 8 and 9 in [5] which are valid for $G = SU(2)$. .

Proposition 10.3. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to equations* (4.8) *and* (4.10), *on* $[r_0, r_1)$ $(r_0 > 0)$ *and* $0 < N(r_0) < 1$ *then* $N(r) < 1$ *for all* $r \in [r_0, r_1)$.

Proof. This can be proved in the exact same manner as when $G = SU(2)$. See [5] proposition 8 for details. $\square$

Proposition 10.4. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to equations* (4.8) *and* (4.10)*, on* $[r_0, r_1)$ $(r_0 > 0)$ *with* $0 < \epsilon \leq N(r) < 1$ *then there exists a* $\delta > 0$ *such that the solutions exists and is analytic on* $[r_0, r_1 + \delta)$*.*

Proof. First note that if the solution $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ exists on some open interval $I \subset (0, \infty)$ on which $N > 0$ then the Cauchy-Kowalevski theorem will guarantee the solution will be analytic. From standard theorems on differential equations, it follows that the solution will continue to exist at $r = r_1$ unless $N \to 0$ or one of the variables $\{m, \Lambda_+, \Lambda'_+\}$ becomes unbounded as $r \to r_1$. By assumption N does not approach zero and $0 < N(r) < 1$ implies that

$$0 < 2m(r) < r_1 \quad \forall\, r \in [r_0, r_1)\,. \tag{10.1}$$

Therefore we only need to show that Λ_+ and Λ'_+ are bounded as $r \to r_1$.

Integrating (4.8) yields

$$m(r) - m(r_0) = \int_{r_0}^{r} (NG + \rho^{-2}P)d\rho \geq \int_{r_0}^{r} NG d\rho \tag{10.2}$$

since $P \geq 0$ and $r_0 > 0$. From (10.1), (10.2), and $N(r) \geq \epsilon$ it follows that

$$2\epsilon \int_{r_0}^{r} G d\rho \leq 2 \int_{r_0}^{r} NG d\rho \leq r_1 \qquad \forall r \in [r_0, r_1)\,,$$

which implies that

$$2 \int_{r_0}^{r} \rho^{-1} G d\rho \leq \frac{2}{r_0} \int_{r_0}^{r} G d\rho \leq \frac{r_1}{\epsilon r_0} \qquad \forall r \in [r_0, r_1)\,. \tag{10.3}$$

Integrating (4.9) yields

$$S(r) = S_0 \exp(2 \int_{r_0}^{r} \rho^{-1} G d\rho) \qquad (S_0 > 0)\,,$$

and hence

$$0 < S_0 \leq S(r) \leq S_0 \exp\left(\frac{r_1}{\epsilon r_0}\right) \qquad \forall r \in [r_0, r_1)\,. \tag{10.4}$$

by (10.3).

Now,

$$\|\Lambda_+(r) - \Lambda_+(r_0\| = \left\| \int_{r_0}^{r} \Lambda'_+(\rho) d\rho \right\| \leq \int_{r_0}^{r} \left\|\Lambda'_+(\rho)\right\| d\rho\,.$$

But,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{r_0}^{r} \left\|\Lambda'_+(\rho)\right\| d\rho &\leq \left(\int_{r_0}^{r} \left\|\Lambda'_+(\rho)\right\|^2 d\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{r - r_0} && \text{by Hölders inequality} \\
&= \left(2 \int_{r_0}^{r} G d\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{r - r_0} && \text{by def. of } G \\
&\leq \left(\frac{r_1(r_1 - r_0)}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The above two results show that

$$\sup_{r\in[r_0,r_1)} \|\Lambda_+(r)\| < \infty\,. \tag{10.5}$$

We can rewrite (4.10) as

$$(NS\Lambda_+')' = -\frac{S\mathcal{F}}{r^2}\,. \tag{10.6}$$

So then

$$\begin{aligned}\|N(r)S(r)\Lambda_+'(r) - N(r_0)S(r_0)\Lambda_+'(r_0)\| &= \left\|\int_{r_0}^{r}(NS\Lambda_+')'d\rho\right\| \\ &= \left\|\int_{r_0}^{r}\frac{S\mathcal{F}}{\rho^2}d\rho\right\| \leq \int_{r_0}^{r}\frac{S\,\|\mathcal{F}\|}{\rho^2}d\rho\,. \end{aligned}\tag{10.7}$$

But

$$\|\mathcal{F}\| = \left\|\frac{i}{2}(\Lambda_0 - [\Lambda_+,\Lambda_-])\right\| \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|\Lambda_0\| + \|[\Lambda_+,\Lambda_-]\|) \leq \frac{1}{2}\,\|\Lambda_0\| + k\,\|\Lambda_+\|^2 \tag{10.8}$$

for some constant $k > 0$ since $(X,Y) \to [X, c(Y)]$ is a continuous bilinear map from $\mathfrak{g}\times\mathfrak{g}$ to $\mathfrak{g}$. It follows from (10.4), (10.5), (10.7), and (10.8) that

$$\sup_{r\in[r_0,r_1)} \|\Lambda_+'(r)\| < \infty\,.$$

□

From this point onward, we will assume that Λ_0 satisfies the coercive condition (7.4). This next theorem can be use to generalize theorem 7 of [35] to any Λ_0 that satisfies (7.4).

Proposition 10.5. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *on* $[r_0, r_1)$ $(r_0 > 0)$ *with* $N(r) > 0$, *then* $\|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2$ *can not achieve a local maximum in the region where* $\|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2 > \frac{1}{2}\|\Lambda_0\|^2$.

Proof. Let $v(r) := \|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2$ and suppose $v(r)$ achieves a local maximum at r_*. Then

$$v'(r_*) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v''(r_*) \leq 0\,.$$

From (4.10), it is not hard to show that $v(r)$ satisfies

$$r^2N(r)v''(r) + \Phi(r)v'(r) + 2v(r) - \|[\Lambda_+(r),\Lambda_-(r)]\|^2 = 2r^2N(r)\,\|\Lambda_+'(r)\|^2\,, \tag{10.9}$$

where

$$\Phi(r) := 2(m(r) - r^{-1}P(r)) = r(1-N(r)) - 2r^{-1}P(r)\,. \tag{10.10}$$

It follows from the above equations that $v(r_*) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|[\Lambda_+(r_*),\Lambda_-(r_*)]\|^2$ while (7.4) implies that $\frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2}v(r_*)^2 \leq \|[\Lambda_+(r_*),\Lambda_-(r_*)]\|^2$. Therefore $v(r_*) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\Lambda_0\|^2$ and the proof is complete. □

The next proposition is very similar to the previous one, however its slightly different conclusion will be useful in proving the next result.

Proposition 10.6. *Suppose* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *on* $[r_0, r_1)$ $(r_0 > 0)$ *with* $N(r) > 0$ *and let* $v(r) = \|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2$. *If* $v(r_0) > \frac{1}{2}\|\Lambda_0\|^2$ *and* $v'(r_0) > 0$ *then* $v(r) > \frac{1}{2}\|\Lambda_0\|^2$ *and* $v'(r) > 0$ *for all* $r \geq r_0$.

Proof. Let r_1 be the first $r > r_0$ such that $v'(r) = 0$. Then (10.9) shows that $r_1^2 N(r_1) v''(r_1) \geq \|[\Lambda_+(r_1), \Lambda_-(r_1)]\|^2 - 2v(r_1)$ while it follows from (7.4) that $v(r_1)^2 \leq \frac{\|\Lambda_0\|^2}{4} \|[\Lambda_+(r_1), \Lambda_-(r_1)]\|^2$. Therefore

$$r_1^2 N(r_1) v''(r_1) \geq \frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2} v(r_1)^2 - 2v(r_1) \,.$$

But $v(r_1) > \frac{1}{2} \|\Lambda_0\|^2$ implies that $\frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2} v(r_1)^2 - 2v(r_1) > 0$ and hence $v''(r_1) > 0$ since $N(r_1) > 0$ by assumption. This implies that $v'(r_1) = 0$ is impossible. □

The next proposition is a generalization of proposition 2.2 of [42]. The key to the proof is the observation that the equation (10.9) governing $\|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2$ can be analyzed in the region where $\|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2 > \|\Lambda_0\|^2 /2$ using the techniques developed in [42] for $G = SU(2)$. It is remarkable that the $SU(2)$ proof can be adapted to the general case with such ease.

Proposition 10.7. *Suppose* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *defined in a neighborhood of* r_0 *and let* $v(r) = \|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2$. *If* $0 < N(r_0) < 1$, $v(r_0) > \frac{1}{2} \|\Lambda_0\|^2$ *and* $v'(r_0) > 0$ *then there exists a* $r_1 > r_0$ *with* $N(r_1) = 0$, $0 < N < 1$ *on* $[r_0, r_1)$, *and* $[r_0, r_1)$ *is the maximal interval of existence.*

Proof. Assume that the solution is defined on $[r_0, \infty)$ and $N(r) > 0$. Then (10.9) and (7.4) imply that

$$r^2 N v'' + \Phi v' + 2v - \frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2} v^2 \geq 0 \,. \tag{10.11}$$

Consider the differential equation

$$r^2 N \tilde{v}'' + r\tilde{v}' + 2\tilde{v} - \frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2} \tilde{v}^2 = 0 \,, \tag{10.12}$$

$$\tilde{v}(r_0) = v(r_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}'(r_0) = v'(r_0) \,. \tag{10.13}$$

Lemma 10.8. $v'(r) > \tilde{v}'(r)$ *for all* $r > r_0$ *and hence* $v(r) > \tilde{v}(r)$ *for all* $r > r_0$.

Proof. First note that it follows from proposition 10.6 that

$$v'(r) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v(r) > \frac{1}{2} \|\Lambda_0\|^2 \quad \forall\, r \geq r_0 \,. \tag{10.14}$$

Because $N(r_0) > 0$, $P(r_0) \geq 0$, and $v'(r_0) > 0$, we get from (10.10), (10.11), (10.12), and (10.13) that

$$r_0^2 N(r_0)(v''(r_0) - \tilde{v}''(r_0)) \geq -(\Phi(r_0) - r_0) v'(r_0) > 0 \,. \tag{10.15}$$

Thus $v''(r_0) > \tilde{v}''(r_0)$ and hence $v'(r) > \tilde{v}'(r)$ for $r > r_0$ with r near r_0. Suppose r_1 is the first $r > 0$ for which $v'(r_1) = \tilde{v}'(r_1)$. Then it follows from (10.13), (10.14), and the fact that $v'(r) > \tilde{v}'(r)$ for all $r \in [r_0, r_1)$ that

$$\frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2} v(r_1)^2 - 2v(r_1) > \frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2} \tilde{v}(r_1)^2 - 2\tilde{v}(r_1) \,. \tag{10.16}$$

since the function

$$k(x) = \frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2} x^2 - 2x > 0 \tag{10.17}$$

is monotonically increasing in the region $x > \frac{1}{2}\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2$. Then

$$r_1^2 N(r_1)(v''(r_1) - \tilde{v}''(r_1)) \geq \frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2} v(r_1)^2 - 2v(r_1) - \left(\frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\tilde{v}(r_1)^2 - 2\tilde{v}(r_1)\right) > 0$$

by (10.11), (10.12), (10.16), $N(r_1) > 0$, and $P(r_1) \geq 0$. Therefore $v''(r_1) > \tilde{v}''(r_1)$ and this implies that $v'(r_1) = \tilde{v}'(r_1)$ is impossible. ☐

Lemma 10.9. *$\tilde{v}'(r) > 0$ and $\tilde{v}(r) > \frac{1}{2}\left\|\Lambda_0^2\right\|$ for $r > r_0$.*

Proof. Proved in similar fashion as proposition 10.6. ☐

Lemma 10.10. *If $f(r) = r\tilde{v}' + 2\tilde{v} - \frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2}\tilde{v}^2$, then there exists an $R > r_0$ such that $f(r) < 0$ for all $r \geq R$.*

Proof. Suppose $f(r_1) = 0$ for some $r_1 > r_0$. Differentiating f yields $f' = r\tilde{v}'' + \left(3 - \frac{8}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2}\tilde{v}\right)\tilde{v}'$. Since $f(r_1) = 0$, the differential equation (10.12) shows that

$$r_1^2 N(r_1)\tilde{v}''(r_1) = 0$$

and hence $\tilde{v}''(r_1) = 0$ as $N(r_1) > 0$. Thus

$$f'(r_1) = \left(3 - \frac{8}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\tilde{v}(r_1)\right)\tilde{v}'(r_1) < 0$$

by lemma 10.9. This shows that f can cross zero at most once. Thus f is either always positive for $r > r_0$ or there exist an $R > r_0$ such that $f(r) < 0$ for all $r \geq R$. Suppose $f(r) > 0$ for all $r > r_0$. Then

$$r\tilde{v}' + 2\tilde{v} - \frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\tilde{v}^2 > 0$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{d\tilde{v}}{-2\tilde{v} + \frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2}\tilde{v}^2} > \frac{dr}{r}$$

by lemma 10.9. But

$$\int_{\tilde{v}(r_0)}^{\infty} \frac{d\tilde{v}}{-2\tilde{v} + \frac{4}{\|\Lambda_0\|^2}\tilde{v}^2} < \infty$$

while

$$\int_{r_0}^{\infty} \frac{dr}{r} = \infty$$

which is a contradiction. ☐

Consider the differential equation

$$r^2\bar{v}'' + r\bar{v}' + 2\bar{v} - \frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\bar{v}^2 = 0 \tag{10.18}$$

$$\bar{v}(R) = \tilde{v}(R) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{v}(R) = \tilde{v}'(R) \tag{10.19}$$

where R is defined in lemma 10.10.

Lemma 10.11. *$\tilde{v}(r) > \bar{v}(r)$ and $\tilde{v}'(r) > \bar{v}'(r)$ for all $r > R$.*

Proof. From (10.12), (10.18) and (10.19) we have

$$\tilde{v}''(R) - \bar{v}''(R) = \frac{f(R)}{R^2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N(R)}\right) . \tag{10.20}$$

Since $0 < N(r_0) < 1$ and we are assuming that $N > 0$, it follows from proposition 10.3 that $0 < N < 1$. Therefore (10.20) shows that $\tilde{v}''(R) > \bar{v}''(R)$ and hence $\tilde{v}'(r) > \bar{v}'(r)$ for $r > R$ with r near R. Suppose there exists a smallest $r_1 > R$ for which $\tilde{v}(r) = \bar{v}(r)$. Using similar arguments as in proving lemma 10.8, it can be shown that

$$\bar{v}'(r) > 0 \text{ and } \bar{v}(r) > \frac{1}{2}\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2 \text{ for all } r > R. \tag{10.21}$$

Thus

$$\tilde{v}(r_1) > \bar{v}(r_1) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\tilde{v}(r_1)^2 - 2\tilde{v}(r_1) > \frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\bar{v}(r_1)^2 - 2\bar{v}(r_1)$$

and hence using (10.12) and (10.18) we see that

$$r_1^2 N(r_1)\tilde{v}''(r_1) - r_1^2 N(r_1)\bar{v}''(r_1) = \frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\tilde{v}(r_1)^2 - 2\tilde{v}(r_1) - \left(\frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\bar{v}(r_1)^2 - 2\bar{v}(r_1)\right) > 0$$

which implies that

$$\tilde{v}''(r_1) > N(r_1)\tilde{v}''(r_1) > \bar{v}''(r_1) .$$

Therefore $\tilde{v}'(r_1) = \bar{v}'(r_1)$ is impossible. □

Lemma 10.12. *There exists a $\bar{r} > R$ for which $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}} \bar{v}(r) = \infty$ and $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}} \bar{v}'(r) = \infty$.*

Proof. Let $t = \ln(r)$. Then we can write (10.18) as

$$\ddot{\bar{v}} + 2\bar{v} - \frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|}^2 \bar{v}^2 = 0 \qquad (\dot{\cdot}) := \frac{d(\cdot)}{dt} . \tag{10.22}$$

So $\ddot{\bar{v}} > 0$ by (10.21) and (10.22). This implies that $\dot{\bar{v}}$ is increasing. If $T = \ln(R)$ then $\dot{\bar{v}}(T) > 0$ by (10.21), and thus $\dot{\bar{v}}(t) > \dot{\bar{v}}(T) > 0$ for $t > T$ as $\dot{\bar{v}}$ is increasing. It follows that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \bar{v}(t) = \infty$.
The differential equation (10.22) admits a first integral

$$H(t) = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\bar{v}}^2 + \bar{v}^2 - \frac{4}{3\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\bar{v}^3 . \tag{10.23}$$

Therefore if we let $H_0 = H(T)$, then

$$\frac{1}{2}\dot{\bar{v}}(t)^2 = H_0 + \bar{v}(t)^2\left(\frac{4}{3\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\bar{v}(t) - 1\right)$$

as H is a constant of the motion. Since $\bar{v}(t)$ is increasing and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \bar{v}(t) = \infty$, there exists a $t_1 > T$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\dot{\bar{v}}^2 > \frac{2}{3\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\bar{v}^3 \quad \forall\, t \geq t_1$$

As $\bar{v} > 0$ and $\dot{\bar{v}} > 0$, the above expression is equivalent to

$$\frac{\dot{\bar{v}}}{\bar{v}^{\frac{3}{2}}} > \frac{4}{3\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2} \quad \forall\, t \geq t_1 \,.$$

Integrating both sides yields

$$-\frac{2}{\sqrt{\bar{v}(t_2)}} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\bar{v}(t_1)}} \geq \frac{4}{3\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}(t_2 - t_1)\,,$$

or equivalently

$$\sqrt{\bar{v}(t_2)} \geq \frac{2}{\frac{2}{\sqrt{\bar{v}(t_1)}} + \frac{4}{3\|\Lambda_0\|^2}(t_1 - t_2)}\,.$$

This shows that there exists a $\bar{t}$ such that $\lim_{t\to\bar{t}} \bar{v}(t) = \infty$. But $r = e^t$, so if we let $\bar{r} = e^{\bar{t}}$ then it follows that $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}} \bar{v}(r) = \infty$ and $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}} \bar{v}'(r) = \infty$. $\square$

The above lemmas show that there exist a $\tilde{r} \leq \bar{r}$ such that $\lim_{r\nearrow\tilde{r}} v'(r) = \infty$ which proves that $\Lambda_+(r)$ or $\Lambda'_+(r)$ becomes unbounded as $r \to \tilde{r}$. This contradicts the solution existing on $[r_0, \infty)$. In view of proposition 10.4, we must have $N(\tilde{r}) = 0$. Let r_1 be the smallest r such that $N = 0$. Then (4.17) implies that

$$r_1 N'(r_1) = 1 - \frac{2}{r_1^2} P(r_1) \tag{10.24}$$

while while it follows from (10.9) and (7.4)

$$\begin{aligned}\left(r_1 - \frac{2}{r_1}P(r_1)\right) v'(r_1) + 2v(r_1) - \frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2} v(r_1)^2 \\ \geq \left(\frac{\|[\Lambda_+(r_1), c(\Lambda_+(r_1)]\|}{\|\Lambda_+(r_1)\|^4} - \frac{4}{\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2}\right) v(r_1)^2 \geq 0\,.\end{aligned}$$

But $v(r_1) > \left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2/2$ implies that $4v(r_1)^2/\left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2 - 2v(r_1) > 0$ and therefore

$$\left(r_1 - \frac{2}{r_1}P(r_1)\right) v'(r_1) > 0\,.$$

Since $v'(r_1) > 0$ the above inequality implies that $r_1 > 2P(r_1)/r_1$ and hence $1 - 2P(r_1)/(r_1^2) > 0$. Combining this with (10.24) we see that $N'(r_1) > 0$ which contradicts $N(r_1) = 0$. Therefore $[r_0, r_1)$ must be the maximal interval of existence thus proving proposition 10.7. $\square$

Theorem 10.13. *If $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ is a solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *defined on $[r_0, \infty)$ $(r_0 > 0)$ and it satisfies $N > 0$, $\|\Lambda_+(r_0)\| < \|\Lambda_0\|/\sqrt{2}$ and $N(r_0) < 1$ then $\|\Lambda_+(r)\| < \|\Lambda_0\|/\sqrt{2}$ for all $r \geq r_0$.*

Proof. Since N cannot cross 1 from below by proposition 10.3, we have $0 < N(r) < 1$ for all $r \geq r_0$. Let $v(r) = \left\|\Lambda_+(r)\right\|^2$ and suppose there exists a $r_1 > r_0$ such that $v(r_1) > \left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2/2$. Then by the mean value theorem there exists a $r_* \in (r_1, r_2)$ such that $v'(r_*) > 0$ and $v(r_*) > \left\|\Lambda_0\right\|^2/2$. The proof then follows from proposition 10.7. $\square$

The next theorem, which guarantees that the mass is bounded, is a generalization of theorem 2 from [27] and the proof uses similar methods.

Theorem 10.14. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *defined on* $[r_0, \infty)$ *with* $N > 0$, $N(r_0) < 1$ *and* $\|\Lambda_+(r_0)\| \leq \|\Lambda_0\| / \sqrt{2}$ *then*

$$\int_{r_0}^{\infty} NG\, dr < \infty\,.$$

Proof. It follows from theorem 10.13 that

$$\|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\Lambda_0\|^2 \quad \forall\, r \geq r_0\,. \tag{10.25}$$

Let $\{X_k\}_{k=1}^n$ be a orthogonal basis for V_2 with normalization $\|X_k\| = 1/\sqrt{2}$. Define

$$w_k(r) := \langle\langle\, X_k|\Lambda_+(r)\,\rangle\rangle\,.$$

Then it follows from (4.10) that for any q,

$$qr^{q-1}Nw_k' = (r^q N w_k')' + 2r^{q-1}NGw_k' + r^{q-2}\langle\langle\, X_k|\mathcal{F}\,\rangle\rangle\,. \tag{10.26}$$

Lemma 10.15. *If* w_k *has a critical point* $c \in [r_0, \infty)$ *then*

$$\int_{r_0}^{\infty} N|w_k'|^2 dr < \infty\,.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the set of critical points of $w_k(r)$. Since $w_k(r)$ is analytic by proposition 10.4 the set $\mathcal{C}$ can have no limit points. There are two cases to consider, either $\mathcal{C}$ is bounded or $\mathcal{C}$ is unbounded. Note that $\mathcal{C}$ is not empty by assumption.

If $\mathcal{C}$ is bounded, let $\tilde{c} = \sup \mathcal{C}$. Then w_k' must be either greater than zero or less than zero for $r > \tilde{c}$. We first assume that $w_k'(r) > 0$ for $r > \tilde{c}$. Then integrating (10.26) with $q = 0$ yields

$$Nw_k'(r) = -\int_{\tilde{c}}^{r} \frac{2}{\rho} NGw_k' d\rho - \int_{\tilde{c}}^{r} \rho^{-2}\langle\langle\, X_k|\mathcal{F}\,\rangle\rangle d\rho \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\tilde{c}}^{r} \rho^{-2}\|\mathcal{F}\|\, d\rho\,.$$

But it is clear from (10.8) and (10.25) that there exists a $\beta > 0$ such that $\|\mathcal{F}(r)\| \leq \sqrt{2}\beta$ for all $r \geq r_0$. Consequently, $Nw_k'(r) \leq \beta(\tilde{c}^{-1} - r^{-1})$ and using

$$\sup_{r_0 \leq \rho \leq r} \beta\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{c}} - \frac{1}{\rho}\right) = \beta\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{c}} - \frac{1}{r}\right)$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\tilde{c}}^{r} N|w_k'|^2 d\rho &\leq \beta\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{c}} - \frac{1}{r}\right)\int_{\tilde{c}}^{r} w_k'(\rho)d\rho \leq \beta\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{c}} - \frac{1}{r}\right)|w_k(r) - w_k(\tilde{c})| \\ &\leq \beta\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{c}} - \frac{1}{r}\right)|\langle\langle\, X_k|\Lambda_+(r) - \Lambda_+(\tilde{c})\,\rangle\rangle| \leq \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{c}} - \frac{1}{r}\right)\|\Lambda_+(r) - \Lambda_+(\tilde{c})\| \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{c}}\right)\alpha\end{aligned} \tag{10.27}$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ by (10.25). Letting $r \to \infty$ in the above expression shows that

$$\int_{\tilde{c}}^{\infty} N|w_k'|^2 dr \leq \frac{\alpha\beta}{\sqrt{2}\tilde{c}} < \infty\,.$$

Similar arguments show that the above inequality continues to hold if $w_k < 0$.

If $\mathcal{C}$ is unbounded, there there exists a sequence of critical points $\{c_j\}$ such that $c_j < c_{j+1}$, $[c_1, \infty) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty}[c_j, c_{j+1}]$, and w_k does not change sign on (c_j, c_{j+1}). From (10.27) we see that

$$\int_{c_j}^{c_{j+1}} N|w_k'|^2 dr \le \frac{\alpha\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{c_j} - \frac{1}{c_{j+1}}\right)$$

and so

$$\int_{c_1}^{c_j} N|w_k'|^2 dr \le \frac{\alpha\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{c_1} - \frac{1}{c_j}\right) .$$

Letting $j \to \infty$ gives

$$\int_{c_1}^{\infty} N|w_k'|^2 dr \le \frac{\alpha\beta}{\sqrt{2}c_1} < \infty .$$

□

Lemma 10.16. *If $w_k' > 0$ or $w_k' < 0$ for $r > r_0$ then for any $q > 1$ and $r > r_0$*

$$r^q N(r)|w_k'(r)| \le r_0^q N(r_0)|w_k'(r_0)| + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{q}(r^q - r_0^q) + \int_{r_0}^{r} \|\mathcal{F}\| \rho^{q-2} d\rho .$$

Proof. Using Young's inequality it is not difficult to verify that

$$q\int_{r_0}^{r} |w_k'|N\rho^{q-1}d\rho \le 2\int_{r_0}^{r} |w_k'|^3 N\rho^{q-1}d\rho + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{q}(r^q - r_0^q) . \tag{10.28}$$

Assume $w_k' > 0$. Then integrating (10.26) yields

$$\begin{aligned} r^q N(r)w_k'(r) &= r_0^q N(r_0)w_k'(r_0) + \\ &\quad q\int_{r_0}^{r} \left(\rho^{q-1}Nw_k' - 2\rho^{q-1}NGw_k'\right) d\rho - \int_{r_0}^{r} \rho^{q-2}\langle\langle X_k|\mathcal{F}\rangle\rangle d\rho . \end{aligned}$$

But

$$|w_k'|^2 = |\langle\langle \Lambda_+'|X\rangle\rangle|^2 \le \frac{1}{2}\left\|\Lambda_+'\right\|^2 = G \quad \text{and} \quad |\langle\langle X_k|\mathcal{F}\rangle\rangle| \le \|X_k\|\,\|\mathcal{F}\| \le \|\mathcal{F}\|$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} r^q N(r)w_k'(r) &\le r_0^q N(r_0)w_k'(r_0) + \\ &\quad q\int_{r_0}^{r} \left(\rho^{q-1}Nw_k' - 2\rho^{q-1}N|w_k'|^2 w_k'\right) d\rho + \int_{r_0}^{r} \|\mathcal{F}\| \rho^{q-2} d\rho \\ &\le r_0^q N(r_0)|w_k'(r_0)| + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{q}(r^q - r_0^q) + \int_{r_0}^{r} \|\mathcal{F}\| \rho^{q-2} d\rho \qquad \text{by (10.28)} \end{aligned}$$

Similar arguments show that if $w_k' < 0$ then

$$-r^q N(r)w_k'(r) \le -r_0^q N(r_0)|w_k'(r_0)| + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{q}(r^q - r_0^q) + \int_{r_0}^{r} \|\mathcal{F}\| \rho^{q-2} d\rho .$$

□

Lemma 10.17. *If $w_k' > 0$ or $w_k' < 0$ for $r > r_0$ then there exists a constant $h > 0$ such that $N|w_k'| \le h$ for $r > r_0$.*

Proof. Now, $\|\mathcal{F}\| = \|[\hat{F}, \Lambda_+]\| \le h_1\|\hat{F}\|$ for some constant $h_1 > 0$ since $[\cdot,\cdot]$ is a continuous bilinear map from $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$ to $\mathfrak{g}$. So then

$$N(r)|w_k'(r)| \le \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^q N(r_0)|w_k'(r_0)| + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{q}\left(1 - \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^q\right) + \frac{h_1}{r^q}\int_{r_0}^r \|\mathcal{F}\|\,\rho^{q-2}d\rho\,.$$

by lemma 10.16. But

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{r_0}^r \|\mathcal{F}\|\,\rho^{q-2}d\rho &\le \left(\int_{r_0}^r \|\mathcal{F}\|^2\,\rho^{-2}d\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{r_0}^r \rho^{2(q-1)}d\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &= \left(\int_{r_0}^r \|\mathcal{F}\|^2\,\rho^{-2}d\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\sqrt{\frac{r^{2q-1}-r_0^{2q-1}}{2q-1}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities yields

$$\begin{aligned}N(r)|w_k'(r)| \le \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^q N(r_0)|w_k'(r_0)| + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{q}\left(1 - \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^q\right) +\\ \frac{h_1}{\sqrt{2q-1}}\left(\int_{r_0}^r \|\mathcal{F}\|^2\,\rho^{-2}d\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\sqrt{\frac{r^{2q-1}-r_0^{2q-1}}{r^{2q}}}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{10.29}$$

From (4.8) we have $r^2P = r^{-2}\|\hat{F}\|^2/2 \le m'$, while $N > 0$ implies $2m(r) < r$ and hence

$$\int_{r_0}^r \|\mathcal{F}\|^2\,\rho^{-2}d\rho \le 2m(r) - 2m(r_0) \le r\,. \tag{10.30}$$

So

$$N(r)|w_k'(r)| \le \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^q N(r_0)|w_k'(r_0)| + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{q}\left(1 - \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^q\right) + \frac{h_1}{\sqrt{2q-1}}\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{2q-1}}$$

by (10.29) and (10.30). Setting $q = 2$ in the above expression yields

$$N(r)|w_k'(r)| \le N(r_0)|w_k'(r_0)| + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{2} + \frac{h_1}{\sqrt{3}}\,.$$

□

Lemma 10.18. *If $w_k' > 0$ or $w_k' < 0$ for $r > r_0$ then*

$$\int_{r_0}^\infty N|w_k'|^2 dr < \infty\,.$$

Proof. Suppose $w_k' > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{r_0}^r N|w_k'|^2 d\rho &\le h\int_{r_0}^r w_k'\,d\rho && \text{by lemma 10.17}\\ &\le h|w_k(r) - w_k(r_0)| = h|\langle\langle\, X_k|\Lambda_+(r) - \Lambda_+(r_0)\,\rangle\rangle|\\ &\le \frac{h}{\sqrt{2}}(\|\Lambda_+(r)\| + \|\Lambda_+(r_0)\|) \le K\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $K > 0$ by (10.25). Letting $r \to \infty$ in the above expression completes the proof. □

Now,

$$G = \frac{1}{2}\left\|\Lambda_+'\right\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{n} |\langle\langle\, \Lambda_+' |\, \|X_k\|^{-1} X_k \,\rangle\rangle| = \sum_{k=1}^{n} |w_k'|^2 \,.$$

Therefore

$$\int_{r_0}^{\infty} NG\, dr = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{r_0}^{\infty} N|w_k'|^2 dr < \infty$$

by lemmas 10.15 and 10.18. □

Corollary 10.19. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *defined on* $[r_0, \infty)$ *with* $N > 0$, $N(r_0) < 1$ *and* $\|\Lambda_+(r_0)\| \le \|\Lambda_0\|/2$ *then* $\lim_{r\to\infty} m(r)$ *exists and* $\lim_{r\to\infty} N(r) = 1$

Proof. Since $N > 0$, $P \ge 0$,$G \ge 0$, and $\|\Lambda_+(r)\| \le \|\Lambda_0\|/2$ it follows from (4.8) that

$$0 \le m' \le NG + \frac{K}{r^2}$$

for some constant $K > 0$. Integrating yields

$$m(r) \le m(r_0) + \int_{r_0}^{\infty} NG\, dr + \frac{K}{r_0} < \infty$$

by theorem 10.14. Thus $\lim_{r\to\infty} m(r)$ exists as m is increasing and bounded above. From the definition of N it is then clear that $\lim_{r\to\infty} N(r) = 1$. □

Proposition 10.20. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *defined on* $[r_0, \infty)$ *with* $N > 0$, $N(r_0) < 1$ *and* $\|\Lambda_+(r_0)\| \le \|\Lambda_0\|/2$ *then* (4.9) *can be solved for* S *and* $S(r_0)$ *can be chosen so that* $\lim_{r\to\infty} S(r) = 1$.

Proof. We can solve equation (4.9) to get $S(r) = S_0 \exp(\int_{r_0}^{r} 2\rho^{-1} G\, d\rho)$, where $S_0 > 0$ is an arbitrary constant. Because $N > 0$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} N(r) = 1$ by corollary 10.19, N is bounded below on $[r_0, \infty)$ by a positive constant $\hat{N}$. Then

$$\int_{r_0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{r} G\, dr = \int_{r_0}^{\infty} \frac{2}{Nr} NG\, dr \le \frac{2}{r_0 \hat{N}} \int_{r_0}^{\infty} NG\, dr < \infty$$

by theorem 10.14. So we can let $S_0 = \exp(-\int_{r_0}^{\infty} 2r^{-1} G\, dr)$ which then implies that $\lim_{r\to\infty} S(r) = 1$. □

Proposition 10.21. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *defined on* $[r_0, \infty)$ *with* $N > 0$, $N(r_0) < 1$ *and* $\|\Lambda_+(r_0)\| \le \|\Lambda_0\|/2$ *then there exists a constant* $h > 0$ *such that* $rN\left\|\Lambda_+'\right\|^2 < h$ *for all* $r \ge r_0$.

Proof. From corollary 10.19 and theorem 10.13, we get that $P(r)$ is bounded and $\lim_{r\to\infty} m(r) = m_\infty$ for some constant $m_\infty > 0$. Then from the definition of $\Phi(r)$ (see (10.10)) it is clear that there exists a r_* and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\Phi(r) \ge \epsilon > 0$ for all $r \ge r_*$. Thus

$$\frac{\Phi(r)}{r^2 N} + \frac{2G}{r} > 0 \quad \forall\, r > r_* \,. \tag{10.31}$$

Because $N > 0$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} N(r) = 1$ by corollary 10.19, N is bounded below on $[r_0, \infty)$ by a positive constant $\hat{N}$. Also note that theorem 10.13 and (10.8) imply that $\|\mathcal{F}\|$ is bounded. So then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{r_*}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r}|\langle\langle\, \Lambda_+' | \mathcal{F}\,\rangle\rangle|\, dr \leq & \int_{r_*}^{\infty} \sqrt{N}\, \|\Lambda_+'\|\, \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}r}\, \|\mathcal{F}\|\, dr \\ \leq & \frac{1}{2}\int_{r_*}^{\infty} \left(NG + \frac{1}{Nr^2}\, \|\mathcal{F}\|^2 \right) dr < \infty \end{aligned} \tag{10.32}$$

by theorem 10.14.

From (4.10) and (4.17) it follows that

$$(rNG)' = -\left(\frac{\Phi(r)}{r^2 N} + \frac{2G}{r}\right) rNG + NG - \frac{1}{r}\langle\langle\, \Lambda_+' | \mathcal{F}\,\rangle\rangle\, .$$

Therefore

$$rN(r)G(r) = e^{-\Psi(r)}\left(rN(r_*)G(r_*) + \int_{r_*}^{r} \left(NG - \frac{1}{\rho}\langle\langle\, \Lambda_+' | \mathcal{F}\,\rangle\rangle \right) e^{\Psi(\rho)}\, d\rho \right)\, ,$$

where $\Psi(r) = \int_{r_*}^{r} (\rho^{-2}N^{-1}\Phi + 2\rho^{-1}G)\, d\rho$. It then follows from theorem 10.14, (10.31), (10.32), and

$$\sup_{r_* \leq \rho \leq r} \exp(\Psi(\rho)) = \Psi(r)$$

that there exists a constant $\tilde{h}$ such that $rN(r)G(r) < \tilde{h}$ for all $r \geq r_*$. Letting

$$h = \max\{\, \tilde{h}\, ,\, \max\{\, \rho N(\rho)G(\rho)\, |\, r_0 \leq \rho \leq r_*\, \}\, \}$$

completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 10.22. *If* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *defined on* $[r_0, \infty)$ *with* $N > 0$, $N(r_0) < 1$ *and* $\|\Lambda_+(r_0)\| \leq \|\Lambda_0\|/2$ *then there exist a constant* $h > 0$ *such that* $r\, \|\Lambda_+'\| \leq h$ *for all* $r \geq r_0$.

Proof. From theorem 10.13 and (10.8) we see that

$$\sup_{r_0 \leq r < \infty} S(r)\, \|\mathcal{F}\| < K$$

for some constant $K > 0$. So then

$$\left\| N(r)S(r)\Lambda_+'(r) - N(r_1)S(r_1)\Lambda_+'(r_1) \right\| \leq \frac{K}{r_0} \quad \forall r, r_1\, \in [r_0, \infty) \tag{10.33}$$

by (10.6). An immediate consequence of corollary 10.19 and propositions 10.20 and 10.21 is that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} N(r)S(r)\Lambda_+'(r) = 0\, .$$

So then letting $r_1 \to \infty$ in (10.33) yields $\|N(r)S(r)\Lambda_+'(r)\| \leq K/r_0$ for all $r \geq r_0$. However, we know from corollary 10.19 and proposition 10.20 that both $S(r)$ and $N(r)$ are bounded below by a positive number $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore if we let $h = K/(r_0\epsilon^2)$ then $\|\Lambda_+'(r)\| \leq h$ for all $r \geq r_0$. $\square$

We are now ready to prove theorem 7.1.

Proof of theorem 7.1. (i)-(v) : These are just a restatement of corollary 10.19, theorem 10.13, and propositions 10.1, and 10.3.
(vi) : Since N is bounded below away from zero and $N \to 1$ as $r \to \infty$, the change of variable from r to τ given by (4.26) is well defined and $\tau \to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$. Therefore to prove *(vi)* we can show instead that $\|\Lambda_+(\tau) - \mathfrak{F}^\times\| \to 0$ and $\dot{\Lambda}_+(\tau) \to 0$ as $\tau \to \infty$. Using (4.28)-(4.33) it is easy to show that $\Lambda_+(\tau)$ satisfies

$$\ddot{\Lambda}_+ - \dot{\Lambda}_+ + \mathcal{F} = \delta(\tau)\dot{\Lambda}_+ \ , \tag{10.34}$$

where

$$\delta(\tau) = 2\mu(\tau) - \kappa(\tau) - 1 \ . \tag{10.35}$$

Since $\lim_{r\to\infty} N(r) = 1$ we have $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \mu(\tau) = 1$ and hence it follows from proposition 10.22 that $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \Lambda'_+(\tau) = 0$. Therefore $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \mu(\tau)^2 G(\tau) = 0$. Also, because $\Lambda_+(r)$ is bounded and hence $\Lambda_+(\tau)$ is also bounded, we get $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} r(\tau)^{-2}P(\tau) = 0$. From the definition (4.27) of κ it is then clear that $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \kappa(\tau) = 1$ and hence

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \delta(\tau) = 0 \ .$$

Another consequence of proposition 10.22 is that $\dot{\Lambda}_+(\tau)$ is bounded. Therefore we see that $\mathbf{X}(\tau) = (\Lambda_+(\tau), \dot{\Lambda}_+(\tau))$ is a bounded, non-trivial solution to the differential equation (9.10). So $\|\Lambda_+(\tau) - \mathfrak{F}^\times\| \to 0$ and $\dot{\Lambda}_+(\tau) \to 0$ as $\tau \to \infty$ by theorem 9.6.
If S_λ is a Π-system then it follows from the discussion in section 6 that

$$\Lambda_+(r) = \sum_{\alpha\in S_\lambda} w_\alpha(r)\mathbf{e}_\alpha$$

where the $w_\alpha(r)$ are real valued functions. Therefore $\Lambda_+(\tau) \in E_+$ for all τ. Since $\mathfrak{F}^\times \cap E_+$ is a discrete set by lemma 8.2 and $\|\Lambda_+(\tau) - \mathfrak{F}^\times\| \to 0$ as $\tau \to \infty$, there exists a $\Omega_+^\infty \in \mathfrak{F}^\times \cap E_+$ such that $\lim_{r\to\infty} \Lambda_+(r) = \Omega_+^\infty$. □

We now show that any local solution that can be continued out to a global solution necessarily satisfies (7.1) and (7.2).

Proposition 10.23. *Suppose* $\{\Lambda_+(r), m(r)\}$ *is a local solution to* (4.8) *and* (4.10) *defined in a neighborhood of* $r = r_*$ *where* $r_* = 0$ *or* $r_* = r_H > 0$*. If the local solution can be continued out to* $r = \infty$ *with* $N(r) > 0$ *for* $r > r_*$*, then*

$$N(r_0) < 1 \, , \quad \|\Lambda_+(r_0)\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|\Lambda_0\| \ , \quad [\Lambda'_+(r_0), \Lambda_-(r_0)] + [\Lambda'_-(r_0), \Lambda_+(r_0)] = 0 \, ,$$

for some $r_0 > r_*$*.*

Proof. $\mathbf{r_* = 0}$: We know by theorem 2 in [36] that $m(r)$ and $\Lambda_+(r)$ are analytic in a neighborhood of $r = 0$ and

$$m(r) = \mathrm{O}(r^3) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_+(r) = \Omega_+ + Xr^2 + \mathrm{O}(r^3) \quad \text{as } r \to 0$$

for some $X \in E_1$. Substituting powerseries representation for $m(r)$ and $\Lambda_+(r)$ into the field equations (4.8)and (4.10) shows that $m(r) = \|X\|^2 r^3 + \mathrm{O}(r^4)$ near $r = 0$ and hence

$$N(r) = 1 - 2\|X\|^2 r^2 + 0(r^3) \text{ as } r \to 0. \tag{10.36}$$

Let $v(r) = \|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} v(0) &= \tfrac{1}{2}\langle\langle\, [\Lambda_0, \Omega_+] | \Omega_+ \,\rangle\rangle = \tfrac{1}{2}\langle\langle\, \Lambda_0 | [\Omega_+, \Omega_-] \,\rangle\rangle && \text{by (2.2) and } \Omega_+ = -c(\Omega_-) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}\|\Lambda_0\|^2 && \text{since } [\Omega_+, \Omega_-] = \Lambda_0 \end{aligned}$$

The solution is trivial for $X = 0$ by proposition 10.2. If we assume the solution is non-trivial, then we must have $X \neq 0$. So (10.36) shows there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $0 < N(r) < 1$ for $0 < r < \epsilon$. Suppose there exists a $r_0 \in (0, \epsilon)$ for which $v(r_0) > \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$. By the mean value theorem there exist a $r_1 \in (0, r_0)$ such that $v(r_1) > \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$ and $v'(r_1) > 0$. It then follows from proposition 10.7 that the maximal interval of existence for the solutions is finite which contradicts the assumption that it is defined on $(0, \infty)$. Therefore we conclude that $v_r \leq \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$ for all $0 < r < \epsilon$. To complete the proof for $r_* = 0$. we observe that $[\Lambda'_+(r), \Lambda_-(r)] + [\Lambda'_-(r), \Lambda_+(r)] = 0$ near $r = 0$ by theorem 3 of [36].

$\mathbf{r_* = r_H}$: From the boundary conditions at $r = r_H > 0$ we have $N(r_H) = 0$ and $N'(r_H) > 0$ and hence $0 < N(r) < 1$ for $r > r_H$ with r near r_H. We know by theorem 7 in [36] that $\Lambda_+(r)$ and $N(r)$ are analytic in the variable $t = r - r_H$ near $t = 0$ and there exists a $X \in V_2$ so that

$$N(t) = \nu t + 0(t^2) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_+(t) = X + 0(t)\,,$$

where

$$\nu = \frac{1}{r_H} - \frac{1}{r_H^3}\, \|\Lambda_0 + [X, c(X)]\|^2 > 0\,.$$

Expanding $N(t)$ and $\Lambda_+(t)$ in powerseries about $t = 0$, it follows from the field equations (4.8) and (4.10) that

$$\Lambda'_+(r_H) = \frac{1}{2\nu r_H^2}[X, \Lambda_0 + [X, c(X)]]\,. \tag{10.37}$$

Note also that $[\Lambda'_+(r), \Lambda_-(r)] + [\Lambda'_-(r), \Lambda_+(r)] = 0$ for r near r_H by theorem 8 in [36].
Let $v(r) = \|\Lambda_+(r)\|^2$. If $v(r_H) < \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$ then $v(r) < \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$ for r near r_H and we are done. So assume that $v(r_H) \geq \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$. Now,

$$v'(r_H) = 2\langle\langle\, \Lambda'_+(r_H) | \Lambda_+(r_H) \,\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{\nu r_H^2}\langle\langle\, [X, [\Lambda_0 + [X, c(X)]] | X \,\rangle\rangle$$

by (10.37). Using (2.2)and $X \in V_2$, we can write the above expression as

$$v'(r_H) = \frac{1}{\nu r_H^2}(\|[X, c(X)]\|^2 - 2\,\|X\|^2)\,. \tag{10.38}$$

But

$$0 \leq \|\Lambda_0 + [X, c(X)]\|^2 = (\|\Lambda_0\|^2 - 2\,\|X\|^2) + (\|[X, c(X)]\|^2 - 2\,\|X\|^2) \tag{10.39}$$

by (2.2) and the fact that $X \in V_2$. Since $X = \Lambda_+(r_H)$,

$$v'(r_H) \leq 0 \Longleftrightarrow \|\Lambda_+(r_H)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\Lambda_0\|^2 \tag{10.40}$$

by (10.38) and (10.39). Suppose $v(r_H) > \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$. Then $v'(r_H) > 0$ by (10.40). But this implies that the maximum interval of existence for the solutions is finite by proposition 10.7. So $v(r_H) = \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$ as the solution is assumed to exist on (r_H, ∞). Suppose now there exists a $r_0 > r_H$ with r_0 near r_H for which $v(r_0) > \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$. Then by the mean value theorem there exist a $r_1 \in (r_H, r_0)$ so that $v(r_1) > \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$ and $v'(r_1) > 0$. But this is impossible by proposition 10.7. Therefore we must have $v(r) \leq \|\Lambda_0\|^2/2$ for $r > r_H$ and r near r_H. □

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank M. Li. and M. Nevins for useful discussions and advice and also R. Bartnik and L. Kramer for helpful suggestions in regards to the proof of lemma 3.1. This work was partially supported by the NSERC grant A8059 at the University of Alberta and the ARC grant A00105048 at the University of Canberra.

References

[1] R. Bartnik, *The spherically symmetric Einstein Yang-Mills equations*, Relativity Today (Z. Perjés, ed.), 1989, Tihany, Nova Science Pub., Commack NY, 1992, pp. 221–240.

[2] R. Bartnik, *The structure of spherically symmetric $su(n)$ Yang-Mills fields*, J. Math. Phys. **38** (1997), 3623–3638.

[3] R. Bartnik and J. Mckinnon, *Particlelike solutions of the Einstein-Yang-Mills equations*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61** (1988), 141–144.

[4] P. Bizoń, *Colored black holes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990), 2844–2847.

[5] P. Breitenlohner, P. Forgács, and D. Maison, *Static spherically symmetric solutions of the Einstein-Yang-Mills equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **163** (1994), 141–172.

[6] O. Brodbeck and N. Straumann, *A generalized Birkhoff theorem for the Einstein-Yang-Mills system*, J. Math. Phys. **34** (1993), 2412–2423.

[7] O. Brodbeck and N. Straumann, *Selfgravitating Yang-Mills solitons and their Chern-Simons numbers*, J. Math. Phys. **35** (1994), 899–919.

[8] O. Brodbeck and N. Straumann, *Instability proof for Einstein-Yang-Mills solitons and black holes with arbitrary gauge groups*, J. Math. Phys. **37** (1996), 1414–1433. (gr-qc/9411058)

[9] S. Coleman, *Classical lumps and their quantum descendants*, New phenomena in subnuclear physics (A. Zichichi, ed.), 1975, Erice, Plenum, New York, 1977, pp. 297–407.

[10] D.H. Collingwood and W.M. McGovern, *Nilpotent orbits in semisimple Lie algebras*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1993. [k6494]

[11] S. Deser, *Absence of static solutions in source-free Yang-Mills theory*, Phys. Lett. B **64B** (1976), 463–464. [k4861]

[12] E.B. Dynkin, *Semisimple subalgebras of semisimple Lie algebras*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. **(2)6** (1957), 111–244. [k4779]

[13] D.V. Gal'tsov and M.S. Volkov, *Charged non-Abelian $su(3)$ Einstein-Yang-Mills black holes*, Phys. Lett. B **274** (1992), 173–178.

[14] J.K. Hale, *Ordinary differential equations*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1969.

[15] S. Helgason, *Differential geometry, Lie groups and symmetric spaces*, Academic Press New York, 1978.

[16] J.E. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*, Springer New York, 1972.

[17] U. Kirchgraber and K.J. Palmer, *Geometry in the neighborhood of invariant manifolds of maps and flows and linearlization*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series 233, Longman, Harlow, 1990.

[18] B. Kleihaus and J. Kunz, *Static axially symmetric Einstein-Yang-Mills-dilaton solutions: I. Regular solutions*, Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998), 834–856. (gr-qc/9707045) [k6190]

[19] B. Kleihaus and J. Kunz, *Static axially symmetric Einstein-Yang-Mills-dilaton solutions: II. Black hole solutions*, Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998), 6138–6857. (gr-qc/9712086)

[20] B. Kleihaus and J. Kunz, *Rotating hairy black holes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001), 3704–3707. (hep-th/0012081)

[21] B. Kleihaus, J. Kunz, and A. Sood, *$SU(3)$ Einstein-Yang-Mills sphalerons and black holes*, Phys. Lett. B **354** (1995), 240–246. (hep-th/9504053)

[22] B. Kleihaus, J. Kunz, and A. Sood, *Charged $SU(N)$ Einstein-Yang-Mills black holes*, Phys. Lett. B **418** (1998), 284–293. (hep-th/9705179)

[23] B. Kleihaus, J. Kunz, A. Sood, and M. Wirschins, *Sequences of globally regular and black hole solutions in $SU(4)$ Einstein-Yang-Mills theory*, PHYSRD **58** (1998), 4006–4021. (hep-th/9802143)

[24] A.W. Knapp, *Lie groups, beyond an introduction*, Birkhäuser, 1996.

[25] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu, *Foundations of differential geometry I*, Interscience, Wiley, New York, 1963.

[26] H.P. Künzle, *Analysis of the static spherically symmetric $SU(n)$-Einstein-Yang-Mills equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **162** (1994), 371–397.

[27] H.P. Künzle and A.K.M. Masood-ul-Alam, *Spherically symmetric static $SU(2)$ Einstein-Yang-Mills fields*, J. Math. Phys. **21** (1990), 928–935.

[28] A.N. Linden, *A classification of spherically symmetric static solutions of $SU(2)$ Einsten Yang Mills equations with non-negative cosmological constant*, 2000. (gr-qc/0005006)

[29] A.N. Linden, *Existence of noncompact static spherically symmetric solutions of Einsten-$SU(2)$-Yang-Mills equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **221** (2001), 525–547. (gr-qc/0005004)

[30] A.N. Linden, *Far field behavior of nomcompact static spherically symmetric solutions of Einsten $SU(2)$ Yang Mills equations*, J. Math. Phys. **42** (2001), 1196–1201. (gr-qc/0005005)

[31] A.I. Mal'cev, *Commutative subalgebras of semisimple Lie algebras*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **9** (1945), 291–300.

[32] L. Markus, *Asymptotically autonomous differential systems*, pp. 17–29 in Lefschetz, S. (ed.) Contributions to the Theory of Nonlinear Oscillations III, Ann. Math. Stud. **36** (1956).

[33] K. Mischaikow, H. Smith, and H.R. Thieme, *Asymptotically autonomous semiflows: Chain recurrence and Lyapunov functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **347** (1995), 1669–1685.

[34] T.A. Oliynyk, *The static spherically symmetric Einstein-Yang-Mills equations*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 2002.

[35] T.A. Oliynyk and H.P. Künzle, *Local existence proofs for the boundary value problem for static spherically symmetric Einstein-Yang-Mills fields with compact gauge groups*, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002) 2363-2393. (gr-qc/0008048)

[36] T.A. Oliynyk and H.P. Künzle, *On all possible static spherically symmetric eym solitons and black holes*, Classical Quantum Gravity **19** (2002) 457-482. (gr-qc/0109075)

[37] E. Radu, *Static axially symmetric solutions of Einstein-Yang-Mills equations with a negative cosmological constant: The regular case*, 2001. (gr-qc/0109015)

[38] R.W. Richardson and Slodowy, *Minimum vectors for real reductive algebraic groups*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) (1990), 409–429.

[39] W.H. Ruan, *Hairy black hole solutions to $SU(3)$ Einstein-Yang-Mills equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **224** (2001), 373–397.

[40] O. Sarbach and E. Winstanley, *On the linear stability of solitons and hairy black holes with a negative cosmological constant: the odd parity sector*, Classical Quantum Gravity **18** (2001), 2125–2146.

[41] J. Smoller and A.G. Wasserman, *An investigation of the limiting behavior of particle-like solutions to the Einstein-Yang/Mills equations and a new black hole solution*, Comm. Math. Phys. **161** (1994), 365–389.

[42] J. Smoller and A.G. Wasserman, *Regular solutions of the Einstein-Yang-Mills equations*, J. Math. Phys. **36** (1995), 4301–4323.

[43] J.A. Smoller and A.G. Wasserman, *Existence of infinitely many smooth, static, global solutions of the Einstein/Yang-Mills equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **151** (1993), 303–325.

[44] J.A. Smoller and A.G. Wasserman, *Uniqueness of zero surface gravity $su(2)$ Einstein-Yang/Mills black holes*, 1995.

[45] J.A. Smoller and A.G. Wasserman, *Limiting masses of solutions of Einstein-Yang/Mills equations*, PHYSRD **93** (1996), 123–136.

[46] J.A. Smoller and A.G. Wasserman, *Reissner-Nordström-like solutions of the $SU(2)$ Einstein-Yang/Mills equations*, J. Math. Phys. **38** (1997), 6522–6559.

[47] J.A. Smoller and A.G. Wasserman, *Extendability of solutions of the Einstein-Yang/Mills equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **194** (1998), 707–732.

[48] J.A. Smoller, A.G. Wasserman, and S.-T. Yau, *Existence of black hole solutions for the Einstein-Yang/Mills equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **154** (1993), 377–401.

[49] J.A. Smoller, A.G. Wasserman, S.-T. Yau, and J.B. McLeod, *Smooth static solutions of the Einstein/Yang-Mills equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **143** (1991), 115–147.

[50] H.R. Thieme, *Convergence results and a Poincaré-bendixson trichotomy for asymptotically autonomous differential equations*, J. Math. Biol. **30** (1992), 755–763.

[51] M.S. Volkov and D.V. Gal'tsov, *Black holes in Einstein-Yang-Mills theory*, Soviet J. Nuclear Phys. **51** (1990), 747–753.

[52] M.S. Volkov and D.V. Gal'tsov, *Gravitating non-Abelian solitons and black holes with Yang-Mills fields*, Phys. Rep. **319** (1999), 1–83. (hep-th/9810070)

[53] H.C. Wang, *On invariant connections over a principal bundle*, Nagoya Math. J. **13** (1958), 1–19.

[54] A.G. Wasserman, *Solutions of the spherically symmetric $SU(2)$ Einstein-Yang-Mills equations defined in the far field*, J. Math. Phys. **41** (2000), 6930–6936. (gr-qc/0003046)

[55] E. Winstanley, *Existence of stable hairy black holes in $su(2)$ Einstein-Yang-Mills theory with a negative cosmological constant*, Classical Quantum Gravity **16** (1999), 1963–1978. (gr-qc/9812064)